Charles English, M. A.,
Sydenham Parsonage.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
LIBRARY
052
EN
v.5

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS LIBRARY

VOL. V.

MARCH—JUNE.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.

1846.

LONDON:
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

052
EN
v.5

INDEX

OF

BOOKS REVIEWED.

*** For remarkable Passages in the Criticisms, Extracts, Notices, and Intelligence, see the Index at the end of the Volume.

Abélard—Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard, pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie scholastique en France; publiés par M. Victor Cousin, 318.

Abélard—Lettres d'Abailard et d'Héloise, traduites sur les Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale, par E. Oddeul; *précédés d'un Essai Historique,* par M. et Mme. Guizot, *E'dition illustrée* par J. Gigoux, 318.

Addison — Expository Discourses on the Rod of Moses. By the Rev. B. Addison, M.A., 237.

A few words addressed to the author of "An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine." By an Anglican Priest, 243.

A few words on the Athanasian Creed, Justification by Faith, and the 9th and 17th Articles. By a Bishop's Chaplain, 243.

Alford—The Poetical Works of Henry Alford, 235.

Alford—An Earnest Dissuasive from joining the Communion of the Church of Rome. By the Rev. H. Alford, 243.

Audin—La Réforme contre la Réforme, ou Retour à l'Unité Catholique par la Voie du Protestantisme; traduit de l'Allemand de Hoeninghaus, par MM. W. et S.; *précédé d'une Introduction* par M. Audin, Auteur des Histoires de Luther, de Calvin et de Léon X., 341.

Babington—The Influence of Christianity in promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Europe. By Churchill Babington, B.A., 241.

Bædæ Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, &c. Curâ Roberti Hussey, B.D., Hist. Eccl. Prof. Reg., 224.

Barter—A postscript to "the English Church not in schism." By the Rev. W. Brudenell Barter, M.A., 243.

Björnstjerna—The Theogony of the Hindoos; with their systems of Philosophy and Cosmogony. An Essay. By Count M. Björnstjerna, author of "The British Empire in the East," 300.

Blunt—On Confirmation. By the Rev. Walter Blunt, 492.

Bohn's Standard Library, 234, 491.

Bowdler—Sermons on the privileges, responsibilities, and duties of Members of the Gospel Covenant. By the Rev. T. Bowdler, M.A., 237.

Brandon—Parish Churches. By Raphael and Arthur Brandon, Architects, 244.

Brown, Abner—Introits; or Collect Hymns adapted to the stated Services of the Church of England. By Abner W. Brown, A.B., Vicar of Pytchley, 161.

Brown, Stafford—"Brethren, pray for us," a Sermon. By the Rev. Stafford Brown, M.A., 492.

Bunsen—Ægypten's Stelle in der Weltgeschichte; Geschichtliche Untersuchung. Von Christian Carl Josias Bunsen, &c. &c., 87.

Burns' Fireside Library, 241.

Burwell—The Corruptions and Idolatry of the Church of Rome. By the Rev. J. Burwell, M.A., Incumbent of St. Philip's, Stepney, 243.

Cary—Lives of English Poets, from Johnson to Kirke White, designed as a Continuation of Johnson's Lives. By the late Rev. Henry Francis Cary, M.A., Translator of Dante, 233.

Cary—The Early French Poets, a Series of Notices and Translations. By the late Rev. Henry Francis Cary, M.A., 233.

Chambers—Bishop Heber and Indian Missions. By the Rev. James Chambers, B.A., &c., 491.

277511

Church Reform and Clerical Delinquencies, 492.
Church Sunday School Magazine, 244.
Churches, The, of Yorkshire, 492.
Collier—A Collection of public and private Documents chiefly illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I., from the Original Manuscripts, the property of the Lord Francis Egerton, President of the Camden Society. Edited by J. Payne Collier, Esq., 120.
Crosthwaite—Modern Hagiology; an Examination of the Nature and Tendency of some Legendary and Devotional works, &c., By the Rev. J. C. Crosthwaite, M.A., 233.
Cruttwell—The Life of Bishop Wilson. By the Rev. C. Cruttwell. *Works of the Right Rev. T. Wilson, Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man*, 269.

Dalton—Farewell Sermon in Lincoln's Inn Chapel. By the Rev. C. B. Dalton, M.A., Rector of Lambeth, 492.
D'Aubigné—History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D.D., &c., 225.
Dodsworth — Sermon on Parochial Subdivision, delivered at St. Paul's Church, Leeds. By the Rev. W. Dodsworth, M.A., 242.
Druidess, The, a Tale of the Fourth Century; translated from the German, 239.
Dudley—Naology: or a Treatise on the Origin, Progress, and Symbolical Import of the Sacred Structures of the most eminent Nations and Ages of the World. By John Dudley, M.A., 488.

Exeter—Transactions of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society, 492.

Fleury, see *Newman*.

Génin—Les Jésuites et l'Université. Par F. Génin, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, 15.
Gondon—Du Mouvement religieux en Angleterre, ou les Progrès du Catholicisme, et le Retour de l'Eglise Anglicane à l'Unité. Par un Catholique (Jules Gondon), 341.
Gondon—Conversion de soixante Ministres Anglicans ou Membres des Universités Anglaises et de cinquante personnes de distinction; avec une Notice sur MM. Newman, Ward et Oakeley. Par Jules Gondon; *précédé d'une Lettre* de Monseigneur Wiseman, 341.
Goodman—The Court of King James I. By Dr. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester; *to which are added Letters illustrative of the personal history of the most distinguished characters in the court of that monarch and his predecessor, now first published from the original manuscripts.* By John S. Brewer, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford, 120.
Gordon—Letter to the Lord Bishop of Cashel. By Francis Gordon, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's Chapel, Edinburgh, 243.
Gregg—Sermons on the Evangelical Doctrines of the Apostolic Church. By the Rev. T. D. Gregg, M.A., 237.
Gresley—Coniston Hall; or the Jacobites. An Historical Tale. By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield, 226.
Gresley—The Real Danger of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. Gresley, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield, 243.
Guizot, see *Abélard*.

Hadden—The Church of England's Commission to her Priests Considered: a Visitation Sermon. By the Rev. T. C. Hadden, LL.B., 492.
Hart—Ecclesiastical Records of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the Fifth Century to the Reformation, &c. By the Rev. Richard Hart, B.A., Vicar of Catton, 241.
Heathcote—On the Practical Doctrine of the Incarnation. A Sermon. By the Rev. W. B. Heathcote, B.C.L., Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford, 492.
Heurtley — Justification. Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford. By Charles N. Heurtley, B.D., 236.
Hoeninghaus, see *Audin*.
Hollingsworth—The Folly of going to Rome for a Religion. By the Rev. A. G. H. Hollingsworth, 243.
Hook — Verses for Holy Seasons; with Questions for Examination. By C. F. H. Edited by Walter Farquhar Hook, D.D., 238, 490.
Hook—She Loved Much: and the Hem of His Garment. Two Sermons. By W. F. Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, 239.
Hook—Sermon on Parochial Subdivision, delivered at St. Paul's Church, Leeds. By W. F. Hook, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, 242.

Irons—The Theory of Development Examined. By the Rev. W. Irons, B.D., 243.

Irvine—Romanism as represented by the Rev. J. H. Newman, &c. By the Rev. H. Irvine, B.D., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester, 492.

James—A Practical Comment on the Ordination Services. By the Rev. John James, D.D., Canon of Peterborough, 238.

James—A Vindication of the Usage of Closing the Morning Service with the Sermon. By the Rev. W. James, Vicar of Cobham, 243.

Jebb—The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland; being an inquiry into the Liturgical System of the Cathedral and Collegiate Foundations of the Anglican Communion. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M., Rector of Peterstow, 161.

Jebb—Three Lectures on the Cathedral Service of the Church of England. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M., 161.

Jesuits—Institutum Societatis Jesu, 15.

——— *Documents Historiques, Critiques, Apologétiques, concernant la Compagnie de Jésus*, 15.

——— *Les Constitutions des Jésuites avec les Déclarations. Texte Latin d'après l'édition de Prague. Traduction nouvelle*, 15.

Justin—S. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Apologia Prima. Edited by the Rev. W. Trollope, M.A., Pembroke College, Cambridge, 228.

Kay—The Education of the Poor in England and France. By Joseph Kay, B.A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, 473.

Kennaway—Poems. By the Rev. C. E. Kennaway, M.A., 483.

Landon—A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church, comprising the substance of the most remarkable and important Canons, alphabetically arranged. By the Rev. E. H. Landon, M.A., 232.

Landor—The Works of Walter Savage Landor, 487.

Le Bas—Considerations on Miracles; containing the substance of an Article in the British Critic, on Mr. Penrose's Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By the Rev. C. W. Le Bas, M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, 395.

Lee, see *Martyn.*

Light in the Dwelling; or a Harmony of the four Gospels, with very short and simple remarks, adapted to reading at Family Prayers, &c., 237.

Lives of the English Saints, 395.

Lushington—The Life and Services of General Lord Harris, G.C.B., during his campaigns in America, the West Indies, and India. By the Right Hon. S. R. Lushington, &c. &c., 1.

M'Nevin—The Leading State Trials in Ireland, from the year 1784 *to* 1803, *with Introduction and Notes.* By T. M'Nevin, Esq., Barrister at Law, 192.

Madden — The United Irishmen, their Lives and Times. By R. R. Madden, 192.

Maitland—The Church of the Catacombs: a Description of the Primitive Church of Rome, illustrated by its Sepulchral Remains. By Charles Maitland, M.D., 475.

Mant—Religio Quotidiana: Daily Prayer the Law of God's Church. By the Right Rev. Richard Mant, D.D., Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, 491.

Martyn—Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mahommedanism. By the late Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge, *and some of the most eminent writers of Persia, translated and explained: to which is appended an additional Tract on the same question, &c.* By the Rev. S. Lee, A.M., &c., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, 395.

Maurice—The Epistle to the Hebrews; being the substance of Three Lectures, &c. With a Preface, containing a Review of Mr. Newman's Theory of Development. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M.A., &c., 488.

Merbecke—The Book of Common Praier noted. By John Merbecke, 161.

Merewether—Letter to Lord Charles S. Manners, M.P. By the Rev. F. Merewether, M.A., 244.

Michelet—Des Jésuites. Par MM. Michelet et Quinet, 15.

Miller—A Plain Christian's View of Fundamental Church Principles, in four Sermons. By the Rev. John Miller, M.A., 243.

Mithridates; or Mr. Newman's Essay on

Development, its own Confutation; by a Quondam Disciple, 492.

Moberly—The Sayings of the Great Forty Days, &c., with an Examination of Mr. Newman's Doctrine of Development. By George Moberly, D.C.L., Head Master of Winchester College. Second Edition, 229.

Montgomery—Letter on the Recent Schisms in Scotland. By the Rev. R. Montgomery, M.A., 243, 491.

National Club—A Report of Speeches delivered at a Meeting of the Members and Friends of the National Club, held at Willis's Rooms, on Saturday, May 2, 1846, 437.

Newman—The Ecclesiastical History of M. l'Abbé Fleury, from the Second Ecumenical Council to the end of the Fourth Century, translated with notes, and an Essay on the Miracles of the Period. By the Rev. J. H. Newman, 395.

Old Testament History, The, Drawn up in Simple Language for the Use of the Young and Unlearned. By a Country Clergyman, 233.

O'Sullivan—The Theory of Development in Christian Doctrine applied and tested. By Mortimer O'Sullivan, D.D., Rector of Killyman, &c., 487.

Oxford—Charge delivered to the Candidates for Ordination, and a Sermon preached at the General Ordination. By the Lord Bishop of Oxford, 242.

Penrose—A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By John Penrose, M.A., formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, 395.

Plea for the Church of England, 244.

Plumstead—Observations on the Present State of Congregational Singing. By W. H. Plumstead, 492.

Pounden—Ephesus; or, the Church's precedent in Doctrine and Discipline. By the Rev. P. Pounden, A.M., Vicar of Westport, diocese of Tuam, 490.

Protestantisme—Du Protestantisme, suivi d'une Dissertation sur le Casuel et d'un Abrégé de la Religion Anglicane. Par Joseph F. P., 341.

Quinet—Des Jésuites. Par MM. Michelet et Quinet, 15.

Ravignan—De l'Existence et de l'Institut des Jésuites. Par le R. P. de Ravignan, de la Compagnie de Jésus. *Mémoire de* M. de Vatimesnil, *sur les Associations Religieuses non autorisées,* 15.

Robertson—The Scriptural Doctrine of the Holy Sacrament opposed to Transubstantiation. By the Rev. T. Robertson, A.M., late Senior Presidency Chaplain of Calcutta, 243.

Russell—Anglican Ordinations Valid. By the Rev. J. Fuller Russell, B.C., &c., 492.

St. Simon—Mémoires du Duc de St. Simon *sur le Siècle de Louis XIV. et la Régence,* 269.

Sales—Œuvres de St. François de Sales, Évêque, Prince de Genève, 269.

Sales—The Life of St. Francis de Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. Written in French by M. de Marsollier. Done into English by W. C—, 269.

Sayers—The Church of England, Catholic and Apostolic in her doctrine and practice; a Sermon. By the Rev. A. Sayers, M.A., Rector of St. Mary de Crypt, Gloucester, 242.

Sharpe's London Magazine, 244.

Sharpe—The History of Egypt from the Earliest Times till the Conquest by the Arabs, A.D. 640. By Samuel Sharpe, 486.

Spalding Club—Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen, 488.

Stephens—The Statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions of England and Wales, Ireland, India, and the Colonies; with the decisions thereon. By Archibald John Stephens, Esq., Barrister at Law, 240.

Strauss — The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined. By Dr. David Strauss. Translated from the Fourth German Edition, 487.

Taylor—The Modern British Plutarch; or, Lives of Men distinguished in the recent History of our Country. By W. C. Taylor, LL.D., 490.

Trench—Notes on the Miracles of our Lord. By Richard Chenevix Trench, M.A., Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants, Professor of Divinity, King's College, London, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford, 230, 395.

Trench—Sacred Poems for Mourners. With an Introduction. By the Rev. R. C. Trench, M.A., 238.

Vatimesnil, see *Ravignan.*

Vaughan — Sermons. By Charles John Vaughan, D.D., Head Master of Harrow School, 236.

Voices from the Early Church. A Series of Poems, 238.

Waylen—Ecclesiastical Reminiscences of the United States. By the Rev. Edward Waylen, late Rector of Christchurch, Rockville, Maryland, eleven years resident in America, 485.

Williams—Sermons preached at Jerusalem in the years 1842 *and* 1843. By the Rev. George Williams, M.A., Chaplain to the late Bishop of the Anglican Church in that city, &c., 489.

Wilson—The History of British India, from 1805 *to* 1835. By Horace Hayman Wilson, M.A., F.A.S., 486.

Woolfrey—Special Pleadings in the Court of Reason and Conscience, held on Sunday, March 20, 1836, *during the Assizes at Leicester. Trial of* W. O. Woolfrey *and others for Conspiracy.* Taken down by Memory, short-hand writer to the Court, 395.

Wordsworth, Charles—Christian Boyhood at a Public School. A Collection of Sermons and Lectures delivered at Winchester College. By the Rev. Charles Wordsworth, M.A., late Second Master, 480.

Wordsworth, Christopher — A Defence of the Queen's Supremacy against Romish Aggressions; in Two Letters to a Friend in France. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of St. Peter's, Westminster, 437.

Wright—Essays on Subjects connected with the Literature, Popular Superstitions, and History of England in the Middle Ages. By Thomas Wright, M.A., F.S.A., 220.

Wright—Biographia Britannica Literaria; or, Biography of Literary Characters of Great Britain and Ireland, arranged in Chronological Order. By Thomas Wright, M.A., 224.

Young Englander — Thirty-six Non-conformist Sonnets. By a Young Englander, 241.

CONTENTS

OF

No. IX.

ART. PAGE

I.—The Life and Services of General Lord Harris, G.C.B., during his campaigns in America, the West Indies, and India. By the Right Honourable S. R. Lushington, &c. &c..... 1

II.—1. Institutum Societatis Jesu.
Tom. I. Bullæ Pauli III. et Pii VII.; Examen et Constitutiones cum Declarationibus.
Tom. II. Regulæ cum Summario, Epistola S.P.N., Monita Generalia, &c.
Tom. III. Decreta a I[a] ad VI[am] Congreg.
Tom. IV. Decreta a VII[a] ad XXI[am] Congreg.
Tom. V. Canones, Indices Decretorum, Censuræ et Præcepta, Formulæ Congregationum, &c.
Tom. VI. Exercitia Spiritualia, Directorium, Industriæ.
Tom. VII. Ordinationes Generalium, Instructiones, et Index generalis.
2. Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus, composée sur les Documents inédits et authentiques. Par J. Crétineau-Joly.
3. Documents Historiques, Critiques, Apologétiques, concernant la Compagnie de Jésus.
4. De l'Existence et de l'Institut des Jésuites, par le R. P. de Ravignan, de la Compagnie de Jésus. Mémoire de M. de Vatimesnil, sur les Associations Religieuses non autorisées.
5. Les Constitutions des Jésuites avec les Déclarations. Texte Latin d'après l'édition de Prague.
6. Des Jésuites. Par MM. Michelet et Quinet.
7. Les Jésuites et l'Université. Par F. Génin, Professeur à la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg. 15

III.—1. Aegypten's Stelle in der Weltgeschichte; Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern. Von Christian Carl Josias Bunsen. (The position of Egypt in the history of the world; an historical inquiry in five books, by C. C. J. Bunsen, Doctor of Philosophy and of Law; Honorary Member of the Royal Academy of Science of Berlin, and of the Royal Society of Literature of London; General Secretary of the Archæological Institute of Rome.) Two first books, and two first sections of the third, with a supplementary volume of Records.
2. Operations carried on at the Pyramids of Gizeh in 1837. By Colonel Howard Vyse..... 87

ART. PAGE

IV.—1. The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by J. O. Halliwell, Esq., F.R.S., &c.

2. A Collection of Public and Private Documents, chiefly illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I., from the original Manuscripts, the property of the Lord Francis Egerton, President of the Camden Society. Edited by J. Payne Collier, Esq.

3. The Court of King James the First, by Dr. Godfrey Goodman, Bishop of Gloucester; to which are added Letters illustrative of the Personal History of the most distinguished Characters in the Court of that Monarch, and his predecessor, now first published from the original manuscripts. By John S. Brewer, M.A., Queen's College, Oxford. 120

V.—1. The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland; being an Inquiry into the Liturgical System of the Cathedral and Collegiate Foundations of the Anglican Communion. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M., Rector of Peterstow.

2. Three Lectures on the Cathedral Service of the Church of England. By the Rev. John Jebb, A.M.

3. An Apology for the Cathedral Service.

4. The English Cathedral Service.

5. The Booke of Common Praier noted. By John Merbecke.

6. The whole Psalter, with the Gregorian Tones adapted to the several Psalms.

7. Gregorian and other Ecclesiastical Chants adapted to the Psalter and Canticles, &c.

8. Introits; or Collect Hymns adapted to the Stated Services of the Church of England. By Abner W. Brown, A.B., Vicar of Pytchley..... 161

VI.—1. The Leading State Trials in Ireland, from the Year 1784 to 1803, with Introduction and Notes. By T. M'Nevin, Esq., Barrister at Law.

2. The United Irishmen, their Lives and Times. By R. R. Madden.

3. Report of Secret Committee on Ireland, 1798. 192

Notices of Recent Publications, &c. 220

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence 245

CONTENTS

OF

No. X.

ART. PAGE

I.—1. The Life of Bishop Wilson. By the Rev. C. Cruttwell. Works of the Right Rev. T. Wilson, Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.

2. Œuvres de St. François de Sales, Evèque, Prince de Genève.

3. The Life of St. Francis de Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. Written in French by Mons. de Marsollier. Done into English by W. C—.

4. Mémoires du Duc de St. Simon sur le Siècle de Louis XIV. et la Régence 269

II.—The Theogóny of the Hindoos; with their systems of Philosophy and Cosmogony. An Essay. By Count M. Björnstjerna, Author of "The British Empire in the East" 300

III.—Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard, pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie scholastique en France; publiés par M. Victor Cousin; forming part of the "Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publiés par ordre du Roi, et par les soins du Ministre de l'instruction publique."

Lettres d'Abailard et d'Héloise, traduites sur les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale, par E. Oddeul; précédés d'un Essai Historique, par M. & Mme. Guizot. Edition illustrée par J. Gigoux 318

IV.—1. Du Protestantisme, suivi d'une Dissertation sur le Casuel et d'un Abrégé de la Religion Anglicane, par Joseph F. P.

2. Du Mouvement religieux en Angleterre, ou les Progrès du Catholicisme, et le Retour de l'Église Anglicane à l'Unité: par un Catholique.

3. La Réforme contre la Réforme, ou Retour à l'Unité Catholique par la Voie du Protestantisme; traduit de l'Allemand de Hoeninghaus, par MM. W. et S.; précédé d'une Introduction par M. Audin, Auteur des Histoires de Luther, de Calvin, et de Léon X.

4. Conversion de soixante Ministres Anglicans ou Membres des Universités Anglaises et de cinquante personnes de distinction; avec une Notice sur MM. Newman, Ward et

ART. PAGE

Oakeley; par Jules Gondon; précédé d'une Lettre de Monseigneur Wiseman 341

V.—1. Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mahommedanism. By the late Rev. Henry Martyn, B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and some of the most eminent writers of Persia, translated and explained; to which is appended an additional Tract on the same question, &c. By the Rev. S. Lee, A.M., &c., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.

2. A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By John Penrose, M.A., formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

3. Considerations on Miracles; containing the substance of an Article in the British Critic, on Mr. Penrose's Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By Rev. C. W. Le Bas, M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

4. The Ecclesiastical History of M. l'Abbé Fleury, from the Second Ecumenical Council to the end of the Fourth Century, translated with notes, and an Essay on the Miracles of the Period. By the Rev. J. H. Newman.

5. Lives of the English Saints, Nos. I—XI.

6. Notes on the Miracles of our Lord. By Richard Chenevix Trench, M.A., Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants, Professor of Divinity, King's College, London, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford.

7. Special Pleadings in the Court of Reason and Conscience, held on Sunday, March 20, 1836, during the Assizes at Leicester. Trial of W. O. Woolfrey and Others for Conspiracy. Taken down by Memory, short-hand writer to the Court 395

VI.—1. A Defence of the Queen's Supremacy against Romish Aggressions; in Two Letters to a Friend in France. By Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of St. Peter's Westminster.

2. A Report of Speeches delivered at a Meeting of the Members and Friends of the National Club held at Willis's Rooms, on Saturday, May 2, 1846. 437

Notices of Recent Publications, &c. 473

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence 493

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

MARCH, 1846.

ART. I.—*The Life and Services of General Lord Harris, G.C.B., during his campaigns in America, the West Indies, and India. By the Right Honourable* S. R. LUSHINGTON, *&c. &c.* London: Parker, West Strand, 1844. Second Edition.

WE rejoice that the popularity of these memoirs has produced the present portable and neat edition. They were written by Mr. Lushington, long and well known as Secretary to the Treasury under Lord Liverpool's administration, and afterwards as Governor of Madras. He was son-in-law of the first Lord Harris, and was himself present at some of the later scenes which he describes in that gallant nobleman's life. The book is written without any pretension, and is clearly a labour of love. But it is full of interest to those who delight to trace the effect which the character of individuals has had in building up the fortunes of this mighty empire, while they were achieving their own elevation from insignificance to renown. Lord Bacon tells us,

"That history which may be called just and perfect history is of three kinds, according to the object which it propoundeth, or pretendeth to represent: for it either representeth a time, or a person, or an action. The first we call chronicles, the second lives, and the third narrations, or relations. Of these, although the first be the most complete and absolute kind of history, and hath most estimation and glory, yet the second exceedeth it in profit and use, and the third in variety and sincerity: for the history of princes representeth the magnitude of actions, and the public faces and deportment of persons, and passeth over in silence the smaller passages and motions of men and matters. But such being the workmanship of God, as he doth hang the greatest weight upon the smallest vices, '*maxima è minimis suspendens*,' it comes therefore to pass, that such histories do rather set forth the pomp of business, than the true and inward record thereof. But lives, if they be well written, propounding to themselves a person, to represent in whom actions both greater and smaller, public and private, have commixture, must of necessity contain a more true, native, and lively representation."—*Bacon's Adv. of Learning, Book* II.

The present period is certainly not barren of these contributions to history. During the last ten years a greater number of

biographies of our distinguished countrymen has appeared than during the fifty years which preceded them, and they are, generally speaking, among the most valuable additions to our national library. Much, of course, depends upon the right feeling, as well as the ability with which they are executed, and those in which the moral is so pointed as to awaken the attention of the reader to the faults and the virtues of the hero deserve a far higher meed of praise, than those which content themselves with a bare recital of his achievements.

In the biographical work before us we are enabled to trace the development of those faculties and qualities which, under the guidance of steady principles, conducted the first Lord Harris, the founder of the fortunes of his family, to well-merited honours and distinction. The father of Lord Harris was a poor curate, with the not unfrequent, though rather inconvenient appendage of a large family, the eldest of whom, George, was by the aid of a relation sent for a short time to Westminster School, and soon afterwards a friend in office, the brother of the Marquis of Granby, who had been at college with his father, and remained *mutatæ memor togæ*, procured for him an ensigncy in the 5th regiment of foot. The perils and vicissitudes of a soldier's life contributed to form and strengthen the principal features both of his moral and his intellectual character; the "moving accidents by flood and field" of his professional life were well calculated to call forth and confirm the clear understanding and steady good sense which marked the latter; and the humble piety, dauntless courage, warm affections, and extreme sensitiveness to the obligations of duty which adorned the former. In order to finish the sketch of his character, we would add, with the permission of metaphysicians, a certain simplicity of manners and constitutional firmness of nerve, and cheerfulness of spirits, which appear to have never deserted him. Soon after he had joined his regiment, he saved, at the imminent peril of his own life, that of a brother officer, who was bathing in the Ouse, and his extreme but natural modesty in receiving thanks for what he considered a common act of humanity won for him, no less than the gallantry of the action itself, the esteem of his regiment. But it was after his purchase of a lieutenancy in 1769, that his character was put to one of the severest tests it ever underwent. The commander of his regiment was a Captain Bell, who had taken our young ensign, then in his 17th year, under his especial care and protection, and they contracted a warm friendship for each other. One day, upon a most trifling pretext, Lieutenant Harris received from his friend and commanding officer a challenge to meet him, *without seconds*, but with swords and pistols, at the ruined abbey of Cashel, where the regi-

ment was then quartered. This lad of nineteen obeyed the strange summons, and, after literally helping his antagonist to climb over a wall, stood to be deliberately fired at twice, though narrowly escaping the first shot, without attempting to hit Captain Bell; he then again helped his adversary to get over the wall, and they returned home. As might be expected, the incipient madness of Captain Bell broke out so violently that he was soon afterwards placed in the confinement in which he died; not, however, before he had told the story of the duel to a most distinguished, gallant, and eccentric officer, Sir William Medows.

"The consequences were," writes Lord Harris in a memorandum which he subsequently made of this event, "the warm friendship of Sir William Medows, which ultimately led me to fame and fortune—the giving me such a confidence in myself, as to convince me that no dangers or difficulties could ever make me act in an unbecoming manner; and, lastly, enabling me to preserve a command over my passions and temper in many after scenes of trial and annoyance."

He borrowed soon afterwards from his brother a sufficient sum of money to enable him to purchase a company, which was in fact the main foundation of his fortune; it is singularly characteristic both of the strength and nobleness of his character, that by continued exertions of self-denial, shown in rigid and undeviating economy, he enabled himself to repay to his brother the 1100*l.* he had so opportunely bestowed on him. In 1774, his regiment was suddenly ordered to embark for America, to aid in carrying on that ill-advised and worse-executed scheme of war, which was destined to receive such an inglorious termination, though the young captain, like every other British officer, foresaw no possibility of any other event than the speedy annihilation of the rebels. His first service was to cover the retreat of a detachment, in which half his company and his lieutenant were killed. In this short essay of actual service his presence of mind and his humanity were equally conspicuous. His next engagement was the memorable attack on Bunker's-hill; his share in it is thus described in his own words:—

"We had made a breach in their fortifications which I had twice mounted, encouraging the men to follow me, and was ascending a third time when a ball grazed the top of my head, and I fell, deprived of sense and motion. My lieutenant, Lord Rawdon, caught me in his arms, and, believing me dead, endeavoured to remove my body from the spot, to save my body from being trampled on; the motion, while it hurt me, restored my senses, and I articulated, For God's sake let me die in peace!"

He was trepanned, amusing himself during the operation by

looking into his own brain with the help of a looking-glass, and finally recovered. In 1779, he was shot through the leg in the attack at Bunker's-hill; a few days afterwards he was present at the battle of Brandywine, seated however in a chaise with the baggage on account of his wound; but this was a durance not to be borne on such a day, and seizing a horse without a saddle, he took his share in the glory of the day, in which his friend and protector Medows was desperately wounded. Soon afterwards he writes home:—

"I am on the tip-top of fortune's wheel, and if they want to write to me they may direct to *Major* Harris, *Commander of the Grenadiers*, second in command under Brigadier-General Medows."

His promotion to a majority had filled his heart with happiness; he saw nothing but visions of retirement and marriage, and he writes with most amiable feeling to his future wife, that though his views are enlarged,—

"The most pleasing object I see among them (and perhaps the only certain one) is, that we shall now be entitled sometimes to throw a guinea extraordinary to the poor, that we could before have ill afforded."

It is not surprising that the writer of such sentiments as these should, in all good and evil which befell him, ever acknowledge in a true Christian spirit the hand of God.

In 1778, he embarked with General Medows upon a secret expedition which was destined against St. Lucia. While General Prescott was employed in securing the bay, General Medows pushed forward under the heat of a burning sun, and seized on the important Post of Vigie, which commanded the north side of the harbour. The French commander, D'Estaing, seeing that General Medows had cut himself off from the main body of the army, and had rendered a retreat impossible, determined to direct his whole force against this small detachment; that he did not succeed, that his apparently certain victory was turned into an ignominious defeat, was mainly due to the intrepidity of Major Harris, and the confidence which his gallant bearing infused into his handful of troops, when even the gallant Medows had thought all was lost but their honour.

"I hope," writes Major Harris, "I am not profane in attributing our success almost to the immediate interference of Providence! Some circumstances would, I humbly presume, bear me through, that the hand of the Almighty was stretched out towards us, or how could it happen that 1300 bayonets with sixty rounds of ammunition in charge of the men (seldom over-careful even of this article) with only four six-pounders, should beat off, and *kill or wound many more of the enemy than their own numbers?*"

This almost incredible fact is also to be found recorded by the pen of Burke in the Annual Register of the year. Soon after his return to England his regiment was ordered to Ireland, and on the voyage, his characteristic quality, presence of mind, and the ascendancy he acquired over all who were associated with him, was very remarkably displayed. An incompetent captain having run the ship into a most perilous situation off the Irish coast, near Kinsale, the crew mutinied and refused to obey any orders but those of Major Harris, and these after many hours of extreme peril were successful in saving both crew and ship. This event took place in 1780. During the next eight years he passed his life in various country quarters, his family increased, his old love of retirement returned with increased strength, and at last he resolved to sell his commission, and, with the money it produced, settle with his family in Canada. He went to London for this purpose.

"On his arrival (says his biographer), he accidentally met Sir William Medows, in St. James's Street, and after mutual expressions of friendship and affection, awakened by the casual meeting of two such comrades in past dangers, he explained the purpose of his visit to town, and his future intentions. Sir William listened with impatience to the story, and asked if he had actually received the money, and if the new commission had been actually signed by the king. He was told there would be the delay of another day in consequence of the Princess Amelia's death. 'Then,' said he, 'Harris, you sha'n't sell out, you shall go with me as secretary and aide-de-camp. I am just appointed Governor of Bombay, and your presence will be a host to me. I'll go directly and stop the sale.'"

Accordingly the sale was stopped. After a few years spent at Bombay, General Medows was removed to the more arduous and responsible government of Madras, and took with him the aide-de-camp who proved, as he had foreseen, "a host to him." This was the most unexpected tide in Major Harris's affairs, which, taken at the flood, led him on to a greatness beyond the flight of the most extravagant aspirations of his youth, which had long been banished from his calm, firm, and happy mind. His sphere of action was suddenly widened; he was transplanted to those distant oriental scenes which were destined, as they were fitted, to call forth the attributes of the most distinguished soldiers and statesmen of Europe. The British power in India at this period, in spite of Clive and Hastings, was still in a critical state, and in no place so much so as at Madras, neighbour to an enemy whose equal India has never since or before produced in intensity of hate, religious, hereditary, and personal, to the British name, and in abundance of means to execute the purpose of that hate upon his detested and sometimes vanquished foes. Tippoo, the ruler of

Mysore, was, in every thing but the accident of walking on two legs, the tiger which he adored, and which his name denoted. It would require the pen of Livy to describe with justice the "inhumana crudelitas," and "perfidia plusquam *Indica*" of this ferocious despot. About the year 1759, his father, Hyder Ali, had enlisted an army of freebooters (gathered from all the parts of Western India in which those scourges of mankind abounded), in the service of the Rajah of Mysore; in a few years, according to the approved oriental precedent, he had dethroned his master and his benefactor and seized the kingdom, and he soon extended his ravages to all the surrounding country. Most English readers, strangely incurious as they are of the history of our magnificent Indian empire, are acquainted with the desolation he brought upon the Carnatic, so that up to the gates of Madras the country, which had been as the garden of Eden, became now a howling wilderness; for who that has once read can ever forget the wondrous power of language in which that desolation and the character of the desolators is described by Mr. Burke in his ever-memorable speech on the Nabob of Arcot's debts. More than once the dreadful whirlwind of Mysorean cavalry, rushing through the passes of the mountain range called the Ghauts, which divide Mysore from the Carnatic, had swept, into a captivity worse ten thousand times than death, officers and soldiers of the British forces, which they had defeated. His son, Tippoo, had succeeded to his father's usurped throne in 1782; the father had certainly more qualities of a statesman than Tippoo, though they have been exaggerated by the highest colouring of morbid paradox, and we cannot agree with Lord Brougham, in his able life of Marquis Wellesley, that Tippoo had the faintest pretensions to these attributes. Both father and son had the sagacity to profit by the advice and aid of French officers, *Nazarenes*, whom for this reason only they detested less than the English. No Indian potentate had ever possessed such abundant and well-organized implements of war. A hundred pieces of ordnance were frequently moved during these campaigns with a rapidity far superior to that with which English artillery could be moved, while the velocity with which his cavalry charged, and the general rapidity with which Tippoo's movements were executed, is described by our officers as scarcely credible. In 1784, when the gallant resistance of Colonel Campbell had caused Tippoo to waste the half of his army in the fruitless siege of Mangalore, and when Colonel Fullerton was on his march to Seringapatam, determined to set free the British prisoners from sufferings too horrible to be named, and to wreak deserved vengeance on the head of their atrocious tormentor—at that very moment the British Government and the Court of Directors proclaimed peace

with Tippoo—justifying themselves in India for such a measure by a reference to our European relations—that is, our relations with France; and in England, by a reference to the impoverished finances—a false peace founded on false reasons—"false blood to false blood joined." France would not have made war for Tippoo's sake alone, and Fullerton had shown he could maintain an army without remittances, while no one denied the hoarded treasures of Seringapatam. This hollow peace continued till the arrival of General Medows, at Madras, and Major Harris, in 1790. Lord Cornwallis, the second Governor-General, had ruled India since 1786, not indeed with the brilliant talents of his predecessor, Warren Hastings, but with prudence, good sense, and perfect integrity, and during three years of tranquillity his government had acquired order and strength to meet the exigencies of a new conflict with the tiger, whose invasion of our ally, the Rajah of Travancore, a district at the bottom of the Indian peninsula, was the immediate cause of the war. Before the beginning of 1791, our ally was reinstated in his dominions, and Tippoo stripped of all his occupations on the coast of Malabar. On the night of the 6th of February, 1792, that successful attack was made on the fortified camp and the island of Seringapatam which closed the war. But terrible had been the sufferings of our troops from disease, want of provision, the incessant rains, and bad management about those essential, indispensable instruments of Indian warfare, the draft bullocks—and once in the very hour of victory, before the face of Seringapatam itself, these evils had compelled the conqueror to break up his camp, burst his guns, and retreat before a vanquished foe. Throughout this campaign, and especially at the storming of the Pettah of Bangalore, of the fortresses of Bangalore, Severndroog, and Nundydroog, Major Harris bore a distinguished part. But God had destined this scourge of Southern India to survive yet longer—the measure of his iniquities was not yet full. Lord Cornwallis concluded a second treaty with this sanguinary, faithless tyrant. The feeble administration of Sir John Shore had succeeded to that of Lord Cornwallis, and Major Harris had passed through the grade of major-general to that of lieutenant-general, and become commander of the forces at Madras, when on the 22d of May, 1798, "a day (says his biographer) ever to be remembered in the annals of British India, because we date from it a new and splendid æra in our history," Lord Mornington arrived in the Madras roads. At the Cape he had become aware of Tippoo's embassy to the French at the Mauritius, and of various proofs that he was only waiting a convenient moment to spring upon his unprepared foes—and at the Cape Lord Mornington's great genius embraced the resolution and prepared the plan, afterwards but little changed, which

was to rid the European and Hindoo of the worst of foes, and to build yet higher the edifice of British power in a manner worthy of its original architects, Hastings and Clive. But Lord Mornington looked around him for instruments to execute his grand design—he looked anxiously, knowing well that, unless those could be found whose head and heart were worthy of the task, his whole scheme would fail—he looked anxiously, but not in vain; he found them in Lord Clive, the governor (son of the hero of Plassey), and General Harris, the commander of the forces at Madras, but especially in the latter, as he never ceased at the time and afterwards with real magnanimity to avow—and incident to this magnanimity was the true wisdom which induced Lord Mornington from first to last to place implicit and unreserved confidence in General Harris—it was well repaid; the unflinching firmness of the man he trusted counterbalanced the palsying effect produced by the dismay of the other authorities (excepting always Lord Clive) at Madras. That general communicated to Mr. Webbe, the chief secretary at Madras, and one of the ablest civilians in India, the secret dispatch of the governor-general, containing the development of his grand scheme; the bearer of the communication was the writer of the work before us, and he thus describes the effect produced:—

"As I had enjoyed many opportunities of becoming acquainted with this extraordinary man (Mr. Webbe), and knew with what deference his opinions were regarded in the settlement, I was dismayed by the expressions of astonishment and alarm which this communication called forth from Mr. Webbe, which were too remarkable to be ever forgot by me. Our unprepared state for war, in the absence of a large portion of our troops in the eastern islands; our empty treasury, and bankrupt credit at Madras; all the horrors of Hyder's merciless invasion of the Carnatic, of Tippoo's sanguinary destruction of Colonel Baillie's detachment, Sir Hector Munro's disgraceful retreat to Madras, and the first failure of Lord Cornwallis against Seringapatam, rushed at once into Mr. Webbe's mind after reading Lord Mornington's letter, and he exclaimed, with bitterness and grief, 'I can anticipate nothing but a return of shocking disasters from a premature attack upon Tippoo in our present disabled condition, and the impeachment of Lord Mornington for his temerity.'"

All the leading men in the settlement to whom the scheme was imparted shared these opinions. But neither Lord Wellesley's confidence in the wisdom of his plan nor General Harris's determination to execute it were to be shaken, though the latter drew up an able paper, in which all the difficulties relating to the preparation, and the requisite army, and the line of march, were fully brought to Lord Mornington's attention. A year was in consequence allowed for preparation, but the resolution to

anticipate the attack meditated by Tippoo, with the co-operation of French troops, on the Malabar coast, by marching to Seringapatam, was steadily adhered to. The policy of the Indian balance of power, advocated by Webbe and others, was (to use that gentleman's own language from a memorandum in the work before us), "the preservation of Tippoo as a power of India, and the balance between him, the Mahrattas and the Nizam by our superior force." Lord Mornington saw that this system, if ever good, was effete. He resolved to have as efficient allies in this war the Nizam and the Mahrattas; both were more than suspected to be hostile to us. At Hyderabad, the capital of the Nizam, where a French subsidiary force was maintained, by a stroke of vigorous policy, admirably executed, an English force was substituted for it, and the French officers and men sent under our care home. By another effort, Poonah, the capital of the Mahrattas, governed by the Peishwah, was freed from the terror of Scindiah, and compelled, from interest at least, to be our ally. A Bombay army under General Stuart, to march along the Malabar coast, and through an invasion of Tippoo's territories join the main army under General Harris, was prepared. But Lord Wellesley's dispatches, aided by the sketch drawn by Lord Brougham in his life of that nobleman, should be resorted to for obtaining an adequate notion of the wisdom and comprehensiveness of his scheme. Still, however, without a careful perusal of the latter part of the volume before us, this great epoch in our Indian history can be but ill understood. The accounts in these pages are taken from three sources—General Harris's public dispatches, his very interesting private journal, and the confirming statement of Sir David Baird. Whoever reads these pages will see how all the qualities of General Harris, to which we have already alluded, shone forth with the brightest lustre; his forethought, the admirable order of his military dispositions, his patience, constancy of purpose, ever-vigilant circumspection, and his sagacity, strengthened by long experience, and stimulated not depressed by the great responsibility of his position. The reader will remark the modesty which made him at first to decline that command which he knew so well how to wield—the magnanimity with which, when no funds were forthcoming to raise the requisite number of soldiers, he made himself responsible for them, and so silenced the opposers of Lord Mornington's policy—the piety which for every step of victory rendered due thanks to Him that giveth the victory—the firmness with which he resisted all advice and all attempts to swerve from his fixed purpose of avoiding the fate of Lord Cornwallis, and of appearing before Seringapatam only to leave it when the British flag was waving from its battlements. He will be struck with the various anecdotes of no mean interest,

the account recorded in General Harris's journal of Colonel Wellesley's appearance in his tent, after his failure in the attack on the tope, the sagacity and kindness of the general in affording him an early opportunity of redeeming the failure; and no doubt the general often thought in after times that the little word "Assaye" contained a sufficient answer to those who maligned the motives of his confidence in Colonel Wellesley. One other anecdote we must notice before we conclude, in the words of the biographer:—

"The hour appointed by the commander-in-chief for the storm, one o'clock, had nearly arrived, when a little before this time, while General Harris was sitting alone in his tent, anxiously reflecting upon the course he had resolved upon if the Sultaun should succeed in beating off the first assailants, Captain Malcolm (afterwards Sir John Malcolm) came into his tent, and, seeing him full of thought, cheerily exclaimed, 'Why, *my Lord*, so thoughtful?' 'Malcolm,' said the general, 'this is no time for compliments, we have serious work on hand; don't you see that the European sentry over my tent is so weak, from want of food and exhaustion, that a Sepoy could push him down?—— we must take this fort or we must perish in the attempt—I have ordered General Baird to persevere in his attack to the last extremity: if he is beat off, Wellesley is to proceed with the troops from the trenches: if he also should not succeed, I shall put myself at the head of the army, for success is necessary to our existence."

The attack was successful; in a few hours Seringapatam, the stronghold of the usurper whose name had filled India with terror, the far-famed capital of Mysore, looking down with apparently impregnable fortifications upon the sparkling waters of the Cavery, which encircled it, with all its vast military equipments, and all its accumulated treasure, was under the command of the humble curate's son. Tippoo was found among a heap of slain. His ferocity was not coupled with cowardice. We have no other eulogy to pass upon him. Many readers of this work have, we are convinced, repeated the words of the Duke of Wellington, in one of his dispatches, "It is a fact not sufficiently known, that General Harris himself conducted the details of the victorious army which he commanded in Mysore."

Towards the close of the little volume before us, there is one chapter with the title "Correction of some mis-statements in Mr. Alison's history." We select one specimen, which, from the illustrious character of the principal person in the legend, cannot be uninteresting to our readers, p. 349:—

"Mr. Alison's description of the first operations of the siege is of the same character. He says, 'The camp was formed opposite to the south-western side of the fortress. The army from Bombay effected its junction on the 9th. The approaches were conducted with great

vigour. In the course of these operations, much annoyance was experienced from an advanced post of the Sultaun's, placed on a rocky eminence near the walls, from whence a destructive fire, chiefly with rockets, was kept up on the parties working in the trenches. In order to put a stop to this harassing warfare, an attack on the post during the night was resolved on, and entrusted to Colonel Wellesley and Colonel Shaw. This nocturnal encounter would be of little importance, were it not rendered remarkable by a circumstance as rare as it is memorable, and worthy of being recorded for the encouragement of young officers exposed to early disaster—a failure by Wellington!

"'Col. Wellesley, on entering the rocky eminence, near the Sultaun-pettah tope, was assailed on all sides with so severe a fire that both the 33rd regiment and sepoy battalions,[1] which he commanded, were thrown into disorder, and he was obliged to fall back to the camp; and such was the confusion which prevailed, owing to the darkness of the night, that he arrived there, accompanied only by Colonel Mackenzie. The young officer proceeded at midnight to the general's tent, at first much agitated, but, finding General Harris not yet awake, he threw himself on the table of the tent, and *fell asleep*,—a fact, in such a moment, singularly characteristic of the imperturbable character of the future hero of Torres Vedras.'

"This is a mis-statement both of facts and dates. The Bombay army did not join till the 14th of April. The Madras army arrived before Seringapatam on the 5th of April, and on the same night General Harris ordered the attacks to be made by Colonel Shaw and Colonel Wellesley, not on a rocky eminence near the walls, but on the Sultaun-pettah tope, and the banks of the water-course which ran through it, nearly three miles from the fort. No annoyance had been sustained from Tippoo's troops, nor had we any trenches for many days afterwards. The nature of Colonel Wellesley's failure has been already fully described (pp. 210-223) and it has been shown that he made his report at twelve o'clock at night to the Commander-in-Chief, who was anxiously waiting to receive it. What is therefore stated of General Harris, 'not being yet awake' at *midnight*, and of Colonel Wellesley's throwing himself on the table, and falling fast asleep before he had made his report to General Harris, as a 'fact singularly characteristic of the imperturbable character of the future hero of Torres Vedras,' is mere fable. Mr. Alison goes on to state, 'General Harris next morning drew out the troops for a second attack, and offered the command to General Baird, but that generous officer suggested that Colonel Wellesley should be again intrusted with the command. But for the elevation of mind which prompted both General Harris and General Baird to overlook this casual failure, and intrust the next attack to the defeated officer, the fate of the world might have been different, and the star of the future conqueror of Napoleon extinguished in an obscure nocturnal encounter in an Indian water-course.'

"General Baird's evidence upon this subject, given only the year

[1] Colonel Wellesley had no Sepoy battalion with him.

before he died, proves that this story is not true. That he suggested *nothing* to General Harris respecting Colonel Wellesley, and that there was nothing calling for the display of any elevation of mind, either from General Harris or General Baird, however natural it would have been for both to have shown this character in the highest degree, if any occasion had required it. The only thing which called for the Commander-in-Chief's indulgence on the morning of the 6th of April, was the blunder in the Adjutant-general's office, in not duly advising Colonel Wellesley of the time when he was to be on the parade, to command the second attack on the Sultaunpettah tope."

These inaccuracies are rather of a dramatic than an historical character.

"The events of the 4th of May (according to the language of the governor-general's order in council), while they have surpassed even the sanguine expectations of the governor-general in council, have revived the reputation of the British arms in India, to a degree of splendour and glory unrivalled in the military history of this quarter of the globe, and seldom approached in any part of the world. The lustre of this victory can be equalled only by the substantial advantages which it proposes to establish, by restoring the peace and safety of the British in India on a durable foundation of genuine security."

No one acquainted with Indian history will deny that the effect produced by the reduction of the Mysorean power is justly described in these words. Soon afterwards Lord Mornington writes to Mr. Dundas, the president of the board of control :—

"I have already had repeated occasion to express to you my feelings of public and private gratitude towards Lieutenant-General Harris, as well as to explain the strong grounds on which both these sentiments are founded in my mind. The share which General Harris has received of the prize taken at Seringapatam has placed his fortune above the want of any public aid : otherwise I have no doubt that the magnitude of his services would have insured to him a liberal and munificent provision from the East India Company. Under Lieutenant-General Harris's actual circumstances, I should hope that his Majesty might deem it proper to confer a distinguished mark of honour upon that deserving officer, and, impressed as I am with the importance of the conquest achieved under Lieutenant-General Harris's command, I trust that his Majesty will confer no honours on General Harris below those of the order of the Bath, and of a peerage of Great Britain. It is my duty to state to you, that any honours inferior to these would not meet the public opinion entertained in India with respect to the importance of the late victories, nor satisfy that sentiment of honourable pride which they have diffused through every branch of the civil and military service in this country. I must, therefore, make it my most anxious and earnest request to you that you will omit no endeavour to obtain for Lieutenant-General Harris the honours which he has so well merited."

The answer of General Harris to Lord Mornington, when apprised of the honours intended for him, is eminently characteristic of the real nobleness and simplicity of his nature. After deprecating honours which neither he nor Mrs. Harris wished for, he adds:—

"Indeed, my dear Lord, you could not have puzzled me more, supposing I was solicitous to succeed, than by asking me what title I should choose to take? An humble clergyman's son, thrown very early in life into the army, entirely a soldier of fortune, with scarce any assistance save his own exertions, is little likely to have any hereditary place he would choose to commemorate, and in my instance the 5th regiment has been twenty-six years my constant home."

We would fain for the honour of our country pass over in silence the incredible treatment which this distinguished officer received at the hands of the country he had so well served. The grossest misrepresentations and calumnies obscured for some time the sense of his service, both in the minds of the East India Company and of the Government. The latter withheld from him all marks of distinction; the former exerted every effort to deprive him of half his share of the prize booty. However,

> "Fair truth at last her radiant beams shall raise,
> And malice vanquished heighten virtue's praise."

And never was the moral conveyed in these beautiful lines more fully exemplified. After six years of litigation, both in the Court of Chancery and before the Privy Council, his share of the prize was confirmed to him, his enemies signally defeated, and his bright character burst through all the mists with which the mean acts of mean persons had for a moment surrounded it. Fifteen years after the capture of Seringapatam, Mr. Perceval, then prime minister, who was certainly a just man, perused a memorial which General Harris had been with difficulty persuaded to draw up in his own vindication, examined the case himself, became convinced of its truth, and was eager to retract the hostile opinion which he had previously formed. In 1815, the General was created Baron Harris of Seringapatam, and received the order of the Bath, and shortly afterwards the governorship of Dumbarton Castle. Lord Harris passed the rest of his time-honoured life at Belmont, a place near Faversham, which he had purchased in the county of Kent—he lived to a good old age, but not without experiencing those misfortunes which Juvenal has so pathetically described as incident to that general but too often mistaken object of human wishes, length of years—he grew old in mourning for many of his children, among others a gallant son who fell at the storming of New Orleans, in America. But he lived to see his eldest

son earn for himself a reputation scarcely, if at all, less brilliant than his own. In the journal kept by General Harris shortly before the storming of Seringapatam, is this entry, "Shook hands with George, and bid him do his duty." George did his duty on that occasion, being one of the first to enter the breach of Seringapatam, and was sent home with the captured colours. And on many other occasions he rendered brilliant military services to his country, which were gloriously closed by Quatre Bras and Waterloo; at which ever-memorable period he commanded the 73rd regiment, assisted in covering the retreat at Quatre Bras, and at Waterloo, being in square with the 30th regiment, he withstood during the whole of that fearful day the repeated charges of the French cavalry, made under cover of the unceasing fire of one of the French batteries, till his regiment was literally cut to pieces, 50 remaining unwounded out of 600 men. When the peril of the day was almost over, while cheering his men and waving his sword, Colonel Harris received a severe wound, which placed his life for some time in jeopardy.

Comparison best enables civilians to estimate the carnage of battles. More men were killed and wounded in the single regiment of Colonel Harris at Waterloo than in the whole army commanded by his father at Seringapatam. Yet it must not be forgotten, being a merit of no mean order, that to the admirable providence of General Harris is to be ascribed the economy of human life at Seringapatam. The grave has recently closed over the last of these two brave soldiers and Christian men, for such were both father and son. And let us observe, in conclusion, that it is to such as they—to men combining the enterprising courage and unconquerable firmness with which

"The steady Romans shook the world,"

with the spirit which, in the hour of defeat, is resigned to the wisdom, and in the hour of victory ascribes success to the mercy of God—with the spirit which distinguishes the Christian warrior, that this country owes an everlasting debt. It is to the union of these attributes in the character of her children, or, perhaps, it may be further said,—it is to the fact that their noble qualities sprang from the root of religious feeling, that we are to look for the real cause of the unrivalled glory and the unparalleled greatness of the British Empire.

ART. II.—1. *Institutum Societatis Jesu;* Avenione, 1827—1838.
TOM. I. *Bullæ Pauli III. et Pii VII.; Examen et Constitutiones cum Declarationibus.*
TOM. II. *Regulæ cum Summario, Epistola S.P.N., Monita Generalia, &c.*
TOM. III. *Decreta a I^a ad VI^am Congreg.*
TOM. IV. *Decreta a VII^a ad XXI^am Congreg.*
TOM. V. *Canones, Indices Decretorum, Censuræ et Præcepta, Formulæ Congregationum, &c.*
TOM. VI. *Exercitia Spiritualia, Directorium, Industriæ.*
TOM. VII. *Ordinationes Generalium, Instructiones, et Index generalis.*

2. *Histoire religieuse, politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus, composée sur les Documents inédits et authentiques, par* J. CRÉTINEAU-JOLY. 5 tomes. Paris, 1844-5.

3. *Documents Historiques, Critiques, Apologétiques, concernant la Compagnie de Jésus.* 3 tomes. Paris, 1827—1830.

4. *De l'Existence et de l'Institut des Jésuites, par le* R. P. DE RAVIGNAN, *de la Compagnie de Jésus. Mémoire de* M. DE VATIMESNIL, *sur les Associations Religieuses non autorisées. Quatrième Edition.* Paris, 1844.

5. *Les Constitutions des Jésuites avec les Déclarations. Texte Latin d'après l'édition de Prague. Traduction nouvelle.* Paris, 1843.

6. *Des Jésuites, par* MM. MICHELET *et* QUINET. *Sixième Edition.* Paris, 1844.

7. *Les Jésuites et l'Université, par* F. GÉNIN, *professeur à la faculté des lettres de Strasbourg. Deuxième Edition.* Paris, 1844.

"THE Jesuits, the Jesuits!" was the exclamation of the unhappy statesman who at the beginning of last year suddenly started up in the midst of his affrighted colleagues, during the deliberations of a cabinet council, under the influence of a fit of fever-frenzy. "The Jesuits, The Jesuits!" is the war-cry of the frantic multitudes which for more than a twelvemonth have filled the valleys of Switzerland with agitation, civil war, and murder. "The Jesuits, The Jesuits!" is the note of alarm sounded at this

time, among ourselves, by those who look upon our ancient Constitution in Church and State as upon the safeguard both of our civil liberties and of our religious privileges. We have no sympathy with the empty philosophism by which the University of France endeavours to discipline the minds of the rising generation into artificial enthusiasm for the social system erected upon the uncouth and unsafe foundation of the barricades; still less can we have aught in common with that wild spirit of Democracy, which has been drained off during the last thirty years from the different monarchies of Europe into the Swiss republics, as into a common cesspool of political offscourings, and being pent up there within a narrow space, without any outlet, is venting itself from time to time by violent revulsions and lawless outbreaks. But we do sympathize most fully, most deeply, with the sense of alarm which recent measures, and, still more, recent occurrences, have excited among ourselves; and the more we reflect upon the tone of mind, and the habits of thought and action which have led to a legislative dereliction of our Protestant principles, and to extensive defections from our Protestant camp, the clearer and firmer becomes our conviction, that so far from the alarm being groundless, we are, both in a political and a religious point of view, standing on the brink of a fearful precipice.

If the question turned merely upon some one or more of the causes of public distemper and perplexity, which in the natural course of human affairs must necessarily develope themselves periodically in the social body, in the same way as ill humours gathering from time to time breed distempers in the natural body; if, for instance, the extensive pressure of poverty upon the labouring classes, the want of an adequate provision for their spiritual instruction and the proper training of their children, the increase of pauperism and of crime outrunning the increase of population; or if, on the other hand, the mercenary materialism of the great body of the trading portion of the community, the luxury and listless selfishness prevalent among the higher classes, the absence of public principle and public confidence, brought about by a system of expediency and political tergiversation; if, worse than all, the lukewarmness towards works of charity and piety, the contentiousness for trifles, and indifference to great and eternal interests, which we have to deplore in a vast proportion of the nominal members of our Church; if any, or all of these,—or if even that greatest of all our difficulties, the monster difficulty of the British Empire, starving, superstitious, disaffected, *demagogized* Ireland,—were all that we have to contend against, though we should see great and pressing dangers,

yet we might contemplate our position without alarm; we might with a calm and resolute eye look about for remedies. But we have not only all these and many more evils of a threatening character to encounter, but we have opposed to us, ready and eager for the conflict, intensely stimulated by the hope of making us an easy prey, closely allied with our most powerful foreign, with our most insidious domestic enemies, lying in wait upon our shores, in the heart of the Empire, and in the bosom of the Church, an enemy more subtle than any enemy in human form ever was, and that enemy bent upon our ruin, more than he ever was upon the ruin of any Church or State. That enemy is the Society of Jesuits, a body of men united, by the absolute control of one presiding will, as one man; a giant, like the giants of ancient fable, a *centimanus Gyges*, and not *centimanus* only, but *centiceps;* a human monster, present in an hundred places at once, with hundreds, ay, thousands of eyes to spy, thousands of heads to scheme, thousands of hands to execute, and thousands of tongues to beguile and to deceive, but one soul, one will, to direct the whole; a monster whose life never dies out, whose devices are numberless and ever changing, but the fell purpose, the bitter hatred, especially towards our Church and State, one, perpetual and unchanged. No contemptible enemy, forsooth, if this be not an exaggerated picture. Whether it be so or not, the sequel will show. Some, it is true, think that such apprehensions are altogether groundless, and laugh them to scorn. The Jesuits, they say, belong to another age than that which prints and travels by steam, diffuses knowledge and conveys intelligence with lightning speed; which dallies with Mammon, and laughs at Beelzebub; which investigates every thing and believes nothing: in such an age as this, surely it is ridiculous to be afraid of an order which received its death-blow seventy years ago. But they forget, if indeed they ever knew, that the order of Jesuits has kept pace with past ages, and not only kept pace with them, but far outstripped them in the race of intelligence; that in the art of turning every new feature of the world to account for its own ends, that order has never been surpassed by any man, or body of men; that even its partial and temporary defeat has only served to place its inextinguishable tenacity of purpose and its gigantic strength in a new light; for while it maintained itself in the hour of its weakness and apparent death by the support of those who, of all others, were the most unlikely to come to its aid—by the support of two powers, one of which it denounced as atheistical, and branded the other as schismatic, it compelled, and that before one generation had passed away, the very power whose sovereignty

it owned, and by whose arm it had suffered itself to be broken in pieces, to restore it, with many marks of repentance and affection, in the integrity of its former station and influence. And so restored it now stands again, firm and upright,

Jam defecta vigent renovato robore membra,

bidding defiance to the nations of the earth, but defiance, above all, like another Philistine, to that Church and nation which stands forth pre-eminently as the army of the living God[1]. And, whatever we

[1] That the British empire is particularly singled out at this time, as the object of attack by the Papal power and the Jesuits, can admit of no doubt. In the nature of things it must be so. The Protestantism of the continent is preying upon its own vitals, and has ceased to give Rome any serious uneasiness. It may seduce individuals from her pale, but it cannot raise a Catholic testimony against the usurpation of the Papacy. If our Church, with her Apostolic succession, and her adherence to the ancient Catholic faith, could be got rid of, then would Rome have an easy triumph. Upon us, therefore, are her forces now principally directed. Apart from the many alarming symptoms of the progress of Popish principles both among our Churchmen and our Statesmen, apart from the amazing advances which the Papists have made towards the attainment of that ascendancy which is the ultimate object of all their outcry for equality, the direction which has been given of late to the Romish Missions clearly shows what is the *arrière-pensée* of Rome at this time. It is to undermine the power of Great Britain by the importation of French settlers and French prejudices, and the strength of the English Church by the intrusion of Romish bishops and Romish missionaries, into all the colonial possessions of the empire. Through the kindness of a gentleman who has paid much attention to the missionary movements of the propaganda, whose head-quarters are virtually at Lyons, though nominally at Rome, we are enabled to lay before our readers the following figures, which must convince the most incredulous. Looking over the last twenty years, it appears that the activity of the propaganda has increased to a most astonishing degree; and not only so, but that it has thrown a share of its activity altogether disproportionate upon the British territory. The total income of the propaganda at Lyons amounted

In the year	1823	to	£916.
———	1835	—	£21,673.
———	1844	—	£161,408.

The total expenditure was

In the year	1823	—	£916.
———	1835	—	£21,663.
———	1844	—	£149,756.

Of which sums there was laid out in missions throughout Great Britain and its dependencies

In the year	1823	—	nil.
———	1825	—	£60.
———	1835	—	£980.
———	1844	—	£40,865.

That is to say, more than *one fourth* of the Romish missionary power throughout the world is set in motion for the overthrow of our Church, and the establishment of the Romish communion in her place. It will be seen, by reference to the above figures, that in the year 1835 the increase of missions in the British dominions bore no proportion at all to the increase of the Romish missions generally; from that year the outlay for missions in the British dominions has been rapidly advancing, till, from one twenty-second of the total outlay of the propaganda, it rose to more than one-fourth. Looking at this increase in comparison with the general increase of expenditure for Romish missions, it is sixfold; looking at it by itself only, it is more

may think, though "wisdom is a defence, and money is a defence," yet shall neither our money, nor our wisdom be a defence to us against that enemy, against whom we can prevail only if we go forth to meet him "in the name of the Lord of Hosts."

What the position is which the Jesuit order has again assumed, what are its deliberate designs, its ambitious projects, and its daring hopes, a glance at the titles of the works prefixed to this article will suffice to show. There was a time when the policy of the Society was to work in secret, to keep its constitution and its affairs from the eyes of men as much as possible; but another age has arisen, in which publicity is the order of the day; and therefore (although we do not mean to insinuate that the Jesuits have no secrets now), in the hearing of all the world, the Society proclaims, to borrow a phrase from facund George Robins, "My name is publicity." To say that the Jesuit order is a lover of darkness, because its deeds are evil, and cannot bear the light of day, must surely be an old wives' fable, an idle calumny; for, behold, the Society, of its own free accord, throws every thing open to the world's inspection; its constitution, its discipline, its rules and regulations, its proceedings past and present, the very records of its latest congregations at the *Gesu* at Rome, are published to the world as regularly as any report of the proceedings at St. Stephen's, and that not by a "breach of privilege," but "by authority." There is no trial to which the Society has in former times been subjected, no scandal that has been raised against it, which the Society is not ready, nay, anxious to submit to the revision of public opinion in this unprejudiced, this enlightened age; its archives are freely thrown open, its ancient scrolls and parchments, those mummies of days that have been, and of bygone deeds, are unrolled before the wondering world. Why should they not? But for the darkness of former ages, which they did all to dissipate, the proceedings of the Jesuits would always have been transparent; those simple-hearted, guile-

than fortyfold within the last ten years. The cause of this increase is no doubt the encouragement which at that period Popery was beginning to receive from the British government. That was the time when our government was courteous, not to say simple, enough to send out in a king's ship, as chaplain to a convict settlement, in the employ and pay of the British crown, that Popish firebrand, Mr. John Bede Polding, who is now, under the title of Archbishop of Sidney, with his three suffragans of Adelaide, Hobart-town, and Perth, disturbing the religious peace of our colonies, and treating the prelates of the established Church of the empire with affected scorn. The sums which are spent by the French Jesuits—for they are the life and soul of this propagandism—sufficiently attest the value they set upon every position from which they hope in course of time to undermine our political and ecclesiastical state. While upon their own colony of Algiers they spent in the year 1844 only £2360, they laid out upon our colony of New Zealand £5618, and the still larger sum of £7280 in the preceding year, 1843.

less men always lived in glass houses, and how happy they are to have fallen at last upon a generation capable of appreciating their candour and cancelling the injustice of past ages; a generation which brings public opinion to bear upon every question; for—κλύειν δὴ θαύματος πάρεστι—none so much as the Jesuits will be gainers if fairly subjected to the test of public opinion:—

"Grave old Tertullian," says the *Ami de la Religion* in its notice of M. Crétineau-Joly's history of the Jesuits, "used to exclaim, that religion required but one thing; and that was not to be condemned unheard[2]. Being the daughter of the Gospel, the society of Jesus also is not afraid to see light diffused over what have been called its mysteries, which are mysteries only of devotion, of charity, of self-immolation. The serious public will in this eminently attractive work find an answer to the attacks and the calumnies of malevolence. As for those who have made up their minds to hatred, they are to be pitied; there is no hope of an obstinacy which delights in blind animosities, and wilfully shuts its eyes to the evidence of facts."—*Ami de la Religion*, vol. cxxiii. p. 70.

The evidence of facts, the evidence of authentic history, of original documents, this is what the Society of Jesus in the consciousness of its more than innocence, in the exuberance of its love of publicity, presents to the world with but one request, that it may be subjected to a searching examination, and to an impartial judgment[3]. With this request we will to the utmost extent of

[2] Nihil veritas erubescit, nisi solummodo abscondi. *Tertull. adv. Valentin.* c. 3.

[3] The collection entitled *Documents Historiques* &c. (No. 3 at the head of this article) is for the most part only a reprint of the most important documents and pamphlets connected with the controversies and proceedings against the Jesuits in former ages, published with the avowed object of challenging public opinion in a more impartial age to a revision of former judgments against them, which, it is alleged, were unjust, the result of blind, unreasoning prejudice. A list of the different articles composing the collection, many of which have become scarce, may not be unacceptable to our readers. The first volume contains, after the preface, and a short account of the destruction of the Jesuits in France,

1. *Actes du Clergé de France, et du Pape Clément XIII. en faveur des Jésuites, de* 1761 *à* 1764.

2. *Précis pour servir de réponse aux accusations faites contre les Jésuites. Mes doutes sur l'affaire présente des Jésuites.* 1762.

3. *Le Rédacteur Véridique.* 1762.

4. *Des Jésuites ligueurs et complices de Barrière et de Jean Chatel.* 1765.

5. *De la vérité, ou de la supposition de l'édit de bannissement des Jésuites, rendu par Henri IV. en* 1595.

6. *Du Rappel des Jésuites.*

7. *Conspiration des Poudres.* (A translation of Dr. Lingard's account of the Gunpowder Plot.)

The second volume contains:—

8. *Réponse aux Lettres Provinciales, ou Extraits des Entretiens d'Eudoxe et de Cléandre. Deux parties et supplément.*

our limits endeavour to comply; and, with a view to our doing so, we must take leave to go considerably further back than the controversy of the day on the merits and demerits of the order, a step or two even beyond the *primordia rerum* of M. Crétineau-Joly, and the *Exercitia* and Constitutions of St. Ignatius himself; to the question, namely, what was it that called the Jesuit Order into being?

We hold it to be an unquestionable axiom in the philosophy of history, that it is not the men that make the times, but the times that make the men; that it is not in the power of any individual, however exalted in station, however strong of will, firm of purpose, or gifted in mind, to fasten upon the world the exergue of his own individuality, and by the mere power of his thought and action to give a permanent direction to future generations. Those whose works and endeavours have endured long, and exercised an extensive influence over mankind, themselves bore the stamp of their age, not, as is commonly supposed, their age and after-ages the stamp of their mind. Genius, though it presupposes transcendent mental endowments, is yet so dependent, for its development and its domination, upon the opportunity on which it brings its powers to bear, that the instinct of adaptation to the peculiar character of the age in which it appears may be justly considered, not only as a characteristic mark, but as a component part of true genius.

9. *Discours Préliminaire de la Réponse au Recueil intitulé, Extrait des Assertions, &c.*

10. *Lettres de MM. les Evêques d'Uzès et de Castres à M. le Procureur-général au Parlement de Toulouse, concernant le libelle intitulé, Extrait des Assertions &c., et de M. l'Evêque de Lodève à M. le Chancelier.*

11. *De la Doctrine du Tyrannicide.*

12. *Monita Secreta Societatis Jesu.*

The third volume contains:—

13. *Instruction Pastorale de Mgr. Christophe de Beaumont, Archevêque de Paris, sur les atteintes portées à l'autorité de l'Eglise par les jugements des tribunaux séculiers dans l'affaire des Jésuites.* 1763.

14. *Remarques sur un écrit intitulé, Compte rendu des Constitutions des Jésuites, par M. Louis René de Caradeuc de la Chalotais, Procureur-général du Roi au Parlement de Bretagne, suivies de cent et quelques contradictions extraites des écrits publiés contre les Jésuites. Par M. Ripert de Montclar, Procureur-général au Parlement d'Aix.*

15. *Pombal, Choiseul et d'Aranda, ou l'Intrigue des trois Cabinets, contenant un Précis Historique de ce qui s'est passé en Portugal, en France et en Espagne à l'occasion des Jésuites, lors de leur expulsion de ces trois royaumes, el des évènements qui ont précédé et suivi la destruction de leur ordre par le Pape Clément XIV.*

With the last-named document, those who wish to hear both sides of the question, should compare the interesting work of Count Alexis de Saint Priest, published last year, under the title "*Histoire de la Chute des Jésuites au XVIIIe. siècle.*" The point of view of the author is, that the Jesuits being essentially anti-national, and at variance with the spirit of the age, cannot and ought not to be tolerated in France; and he endeavours to bring past history in aid of his position. Various interesting pieces are contained in an appendix to this volume; among them the Brief of Clement XIV. which cashiered, and the Bull of Pope Pius VII. which restored, the order.

Καιρὸς γὰρ, ὅσπερ ἀνδράσι
μέγιστος ἔργου παντὸς ἔστ' ἐπιστάτης.

Whenever a man is pre-eminently possessed of that instinct, he is sure to leave a deep and lasting impression behind him,

> " His power's a crescent, and his auguring hope
> Says " (and says truly), " it will come to the full."

And *vice versâ*, whenever the conceptions of a mind have outlived its age, and left a long track behind on the ever-flowing tide of events, it is a sure proof that that man comprehended the signs of his time, that his soul was lodged in the very heart of humanity, and had a supernatural insight, such as the somnambule state is said to produce, into its secret distempers. So it was with Ignatius Loyola. There was a film over his mental vision, the film of the Papal delusion; that film prevented him from seeing clearly what was needed to heal the distemper of the times; yet he saw it in some measure: and it is to this, his appreciation of the state of the Church and the world, as both presented themselves in his day, that we must attribute the permanent duration and the extensive success of the Institute which he founded. Nothing can be more unphilosophical, nothing more contrary to the inner truth of history, than the notion that a society, which not merely influenced, but to a great extent controlled, the march of the human mind and the course of events all over the world, for the space of two hundred years, and which appears to be destined to achieve yet greater triumphs, and to do more extensive mischief, was nothing more than the wild conception of an overwrought and partially diseased brain. So far from being an accidental *hors-d'œuvre* in the history of the Christian Church, the Society of Jesus was, on the contrary, the direct offspring of the circumstances and necessities of the times; its erection was the only alternative left to Popery, if the iniquity of its system was to be maintained, and the call to repentance so loudly, often it may be harshly, uttered by the Reformation, to be resisted.

Based originally upon an untrue foundation, the universal spiritual monarchy of Rome, that splendid but anti-christian dream of the middle ages, had, in its endeavours to maintain itself, become entangled in a net of falsehood and iniquity of its own fabrication; a net so closely woven that there was no escape from it, except by a gigantic moral effort, such as could not be expected of those who were from time to time called to occupy the " chair of St. Peter." By little and little the falsehood came to be seen through; the iniquity, by the very burdens which it laid upon the nations of the earth, became hateful and apparent; and

when at last the primitive truths of the Gospel of Christ were disinterred from under the superstitions which through long ages had been accumulated upon them, and placed in contrast with the doctrine, the discipline, and practice of the Romish hierarchy, the indignation of a long deluded and rudely undeceived world knew no bounds. The grossly earthly character to which the Roman usurpation had by degrees sunk down; its unblushing avarice and its simoniacal traffic with holy things, yea, with the very remission of sins, for which Christ paid the price of his blood; the luxury and the carnal excesses by which the sanctuary was defiled; the barbarities which in the name of the religion of mercy had been perpetrated by the butchers of the Holy Inquisition, were so revolting, that they destroyed all moral reverence for an authority which had been propped up by such supports; if it had been possible, they would have brought the Gospel itself and the name of Christ into everlasting hatred and contempt among mankind. As it was, it became wholly impossible to uphold the pontifical supremacy, and the hierarchy which bore sway in its name, any longer by those means which had formerly sufficed to keep down occasional symptoms of discontent, and to make the nations bow their heads in the obedience of an abused faith. Unless some new power arose to re-establish the tottering authority of the Roman Pontiff upon a fresh and a more solid foundation, the whole fabric of the Papacy, which had been so warily erected during the course of centuries, must inevitably have crumbled in the dust before the moral and intellectual strength, and the religious enthusiasm of the Reformation. This was felt most deeply by Rome herself, openly acknowledged by the Papal legates in their opening address to the Tridentine Council, and kept in view throughout the proceedings of the Council, as the *Decretum de Reformatione* variously attests. But no deliberative assembly, least of all, one composed of men many of whom were deeply implicated in the iniquities of the times, could call forth the novel power of which Rome stood in need. They might restrain excesses, they might lop off excrescences, but they had no power to create a new instrument, full of health, and life, and vigour, to stand forth in support of their falling cause. Such a creation could only be the work of some master mind, animated by an unquestioning faith in the Apostolicity and divine authority of the Roman hierarchy, and deeply impressed with both the possibility and the necessity of applying a remedy to the corruption of the times. Such a master mind was Loyola. He comprehended the condition of the Church as far as a mind wedded to the fundamental errors of the Papal theory could comprehend it, and he devised with a skill and firmness of purpose rarely equalled the

only system which could preserve the spiritual monarchy of Rome from sinking under the weight of its internal corruption.

That system was admirably calculated for the exigencies which evoked it. The assertion of the external unity of the Church under the dominion of the Pope, and of the claim of the latter to an external power of government over the kingdoms of the earth, lies at the foundation. The association contemplated by Loyola was to be an instrument at once ready and powerful for the maintenance of those fundamental principles of Popery in the world; and in order to render that instrument more certainly and more permanently serviceable, he determined to keep it free from all the influences which had proved so fatal to the hierarchy of former days. For this purpose, he not only adopted into his Institute the vows of celibacy and of poverty, but by the vow of perfect obedience, and by the renunciation of all ecclesiastical preferment for the members of his order, he guarded against those jealousies and schemes of personal aggrandizement and of worldly ambition, to which the interests of the Church had been so fatally sacrificed, both by the secular Clergy and by the religious orders. And while he extended his views to every field of spiritual influence, from the village school to the royal confessional, he took care that his labourers should not be encumbered by any formal observances, such as the rules of other religious orders imposed upon their members; and that not one of them should ever be able to form for himself a personal sphere of action, distinct from that general action in which, as a member of the entire body, he should be involved.

How then did Loyola accomplish this difficult task? The first thing which he devised, that which still is the first thing put into the hands of every willing and of every unconscious candidate for admission to the order, is his famous book entitled "*Exercitia Spiritualia.*" "These exercises," says M. de Ravignan[4], "are

[4] *De l'Existence et de l'Institut des Jésuites*, p. 12. This pamphlet, which, according to the *Ami de la Religion*, went through four editions, amounting altogether to 25,000 copies, in little more than a twelvemonth after its appearance, and which has since reached the sixth edition, is, on account of the high respectability of its author, the most powerful defence which has been made for the society. M. de Ravignan was originally a distinguished member of the legal profession, and highly connected; he afterwards joined the order of Loyola, and produced a great sensation in Paris by his pulpit eloquence. It was not, however, then known that he had become a Jesuit, and the encomium which the *Constitutionnel* bestowed upon the celebrated preacher afforded the *Univers* the triumph of informing its contemporary that it had lavished its praises upon "*un Révérend Père Jésuite.*" M. de Ravignan speaks of the Institute with all the ardour and enthusiasm of a neophyte; the following passage appears to contain the history of his conversion:

"A man has been pursuing a wrong course in life; he has been losing himself in crooked ways, amidst foolish opinions and unruly passions. Ambition, the quick affections of youth, perhaps his very success, have lavished their enjoyments upon

not our Institute; they do not even, properly speaking, form part of our rules; but they are, I admit, its soul, and as it were its fountain." To this book, then, if we would know the spirit of

him; he has had his fill of them. He becomes sad, and sits down by the road-side, like a weary and disappointed traveller.

"All at once he feels a desire to find something better, to fly into the arms of that happiness, the want of which renders him desolate. He seeks after God; he would fain lay hold on Him again, draw near to Him, in order to lift up his downcast soul, and to calm the anguish caused him by the terrible judgments of conscience.

"Urged by an undefinable longing, he bursts his bonds. In one of those hours which God knows, and marks with the seal of his infinite attentions, he flees, the newly enlisted disciple of repentance, into that solitude to which the Lord calls him in order to speak to his heart. He has resolved to live for a time unknown, hidden, far removed from the illusions which had fascinated him, from the tumult which had stunned him. Noble effort! generous enterprise! for nothing is so difficult as to tear one's self away from agitation, from noise, and from all those powerful snares which one deplores and loves at one and the same time.

"The first beginning indeed is painful; but soon one feels that happiness commences, that after so many cruel fluctuations one has ceased to be tossed: it is the transition from the storm to the port. One also feels that one has found the needed friend, the disinterested friend who was wanting, the father of a new existence. One hears the voice of God in the enlightened priest who counsels and directs. It is he who teaches one to handle the spiritual weapons of the *exercitia*, and distributes them suitably for the combats in preparation.

"The generous refugee proceeds then to pitch his tent for thirty days in solitude, and to accomplish the great work of those regenerating and transforming exercises; like so many others before him, he is born anew to a pure, strong, and devoted life.

"The end, however, of the enterprise is propounded without circumlocution. I read on the title: 'Spiritual exercises to learn to conquer one's self, and to regulate the whole future course of life, without taking counsel with any unruly affection.'

"I still remember the impression which these words produced upon me, when I read them for the first time; I saw in them all the engagements of my future life. Immense purpose, said I to myself, noble aim of a higher philosophy, whose object it is to establish in the soul the sovereign empire of truth, grace and virtue."—pp. 15, 16.

The following is a brief sketch of the contents of M. de Ravignan's pamphlet. After a short introduction, in which he reviews the state of the question, as it stood at the time, he considers in the first chapter the *Exercitia Spiritualia*, "an admirable book, which is all life and spirit," with a view to show both their value as a manual of edification, and their use in determining the choice of one's state of life. The constitutions of the Jesuits form the subject of the second chapter; the preliminaries of admission to the novitiate are discussed; then follow the two years of novitiate with their ascetic discipline, the course of studies to be pursued after taking the vows, and the probationary year preceding admission to holy orders. After this M. de Ravignan gives an account of the government of the society, and of the manner in which a Jesuit spends his day; and, lastly, he enters upon what he calls the "*point capital*" of the Institute, the obligation to absolute obedience, which he attempts to justify by the analogy of military obedience. In the third chapter he endeavours to vindicate the society from the charges brought against it on account of its doctrines; and in the fourth chapter he glorifies the order on the score of its missions. In conclusion, he protests against the injustice of former proceedings and of the present outcry against the society, and quotes himself as an evidence, that a man may "freely and conscientiously become a Jesuit, without resigning his reason, or renouncing his age and his country;" a mode of argument on which Mr. Génin justly observes: "All through it is the personality of M. de Ravignan which the author extends to his entire order; he paints his own portrait, and writes underneath: 'Portrait of the Jesuits.'" Of the appendix, containing the legal opinion of

the order, our attention must be particularly directed. And first as to its outline. After certain preliminary notices *(Annotationes)* we are met at the threshold, under the head "*Principium sive Fundamentum*," by a statement which not only no Christian can gainsay, but which we should think no Deist can peruse without being startled by its truth:—

"Man is created to this end, that he should praise and worship the Lord his God, and, serving him, should ultimately be saved. All other things upon the earth are created for man's sake, to assist him in the prosecution of the end of his own creation; whence it follows that we are to use them, or to abstain from them, so far as they either forward or obstruct the prosecution of that end. Wherefore we are to feel indifferent touching all created things (according as this is permitted and not forbidden to the freedom of our will); so that, as far as in us lies, we may not seek health rather than sickness, nor riches rather than poverty, honour rather than contempt, a long life rather than a short one: but it is fitting that we should of all things choose and desire those only which lead to the end for which we are created."—*Exerc. Spir.* 1*a Hebdom. Princ.* p. 31, *Ed. Aven.*

Upon this basis the exercises proceed through four stages, entitled weeks, because the time occupied by them will last about that period, so as to finish the whole in a month; although this division of time is not intended to be strictly adhered to in practice. The first of these divisions, or "weeks," is appropriated to the contemplation of sin and its consequences; the second to the history of our Lord from the incarnation to his entry into Jerusalem; the third to his passion; the fourth to his resurrection and ascension. During the first three weeks, five hours of meditation on the subjects given are appointed, viz.: in the middle of the night, at daybreak, about the time of saying mass, about the time of vespers, and before supper; in the fourth week the hour in the middle of the night is relaxed.

The arrangement of the subjects for these different hours is (with two exceptions, of which more hereafter) as follows:—The hour in the night and the hour at daybreak, in the last week the latter only, are occupied with the first meditation upon the subjects of the day; the two following hours are given to repetitory meditations; the last is devoted to what is termed *Applicatio Sensuum*. This is described as follows:—

"After the preparatory prayer, and the three preludes before men-

M. de Vatimesnil, minister of public instruction under Charles X., on the laws affecting the order in France, it is unnecessary to say any thing, as that point has since been decided in an adverse sense by the French legislature.

tioned[5], it is useful above all to bring the five imaginary senses to bear upon the first and second contemplation," (by which the subject was first brought before the mind,) "in the manner following, according to the nature of the subject.

"The first point is, to *behold* in imagination all the persons, and having noted all the circumstances concerning them, to draw thence improvement for ourselves.

"The second point is, to *hear* as it were what they say, or what it is fitting they should say, and to turn all this to account for ourselves.

"The third point is, to perceive by a certain internal *taste* and *smell*, how pleasant and sweet is the divinity of the soul and of its virtues and other properties, according to the character of the person which we are contemplating; applying to ourselves whatever may in any way do us good.

"The fourth point is, by an internal *touch* to handle and to kiss the garments, the places, the footsteps, and all other things connected with those persons, whence we may gather a greater increase of devotion or of any other spiritual good.

"This contemplation is to be terminated by a colloquy[6], like the former, adding again a *Pater Noster*."—*Exercit. Spirit. 2a Hebd. 5a Contempl.* pp. 71, 72.

Here the tendency of these exercises to carnalize by an artificial excitement of the sensual nerves, (for what else can be meant by the *quinque sensus imaginarii?*) what the mind ought spiritually to realize, clearly appears; but this is a part only of an entire system of sensualizing things spiritual. That system is more fully developed in the *Annotationes*, where, *ex. gr.* the exercitant is directed during the first and third weeks to shut himself up in the dark; during the second week to select light or darkness as may best suit the subject of meditation; and during the last week to seek the light and the air, especially in fine weather; thus calling in these outward influences for the purpose of inducing sad or cheerful emotions, in harmony with the particular disposition of mind in which, agreeably to the minute directions given on this point also, each exercise is to be gone through. This excitement of the senses and the imagination is, however, more particularly brought into play during the first

[5] These are: 1. To place before the mind the historical fact to be meditated upon. 2. To arrange the place of action, first comprehending in imaginary vision the whole circuit of the earth, with all the various nations which inhabit it, and then fixing the mind upon the scene of the particular transaction in question. 3. A supplication for grace for an inward understanding of the historical fact contemplated, with a view to more fervent love and zeal in God's service.—*Exerc. Spir. 2a Hebd. 1æ Diei Medit. 1a.* pp. 65, 66.

[6] The "colloquies" at the end of the different contemplations are addresses in language carefully selected (*disquisitis studiose verbis*) "to the Three Divine Persons, to the Incarnate Word, and to his Mother," in reference to the subject meditated upon, and its application to the "exercitant."

week, in which the prescription for the five daily meditations is the same on every day of the week, or as long as that portion of the exercises may, according to the appointment of the spiritual director, under whose guidance the exercitant is placed, be protracted. That prescription is as follows: The first hour's meditation (in the middle of the night) has for its subject sin in general; first, the sin of the fallen angels; secondly, the sin of our first parents; thirdly, mortal sin: the second hour's meditation, (at daybreak,) is set apart for the contemplation of the exercitant's own personal sins, committed during the whole course of his past life, with a view to self-knowledge and self-condemnation: the third and fourth hours (about mass and vesper time) are devoted to a repetition of the foregoing two meditations, with the addition of three colloquial addresses at the close, the first to the Virgin, the second to Christ, the third to God the Father: lastly, the fifth and last hour of meditation is given to the "contemplation of hell;" which answers to the *applicatio sensuum* of the closing hour during the other three weeks. After a preparatory prayer for grace, that all our powers and actions may be directed sincerely to God's glory and worship, the directions for this exercise run as follows:

"The first prelude in this exercise refers to the arrangement of the place, the eyes of the imagination being fixed upon the length, breadth, and depth of hell.

"The second prelude consists in asking an inward apprehension of the punishments which the damned are suffering, so that, if at any time I should lose sight of the love of God, the fear of punishment at least may restrain me from sin.

"The first point of the exercise is, to behold in imagination the vast burnings of hell, and the souls enclosed in a kind of bodies of fire, as in houses of correction.

"The second point is, to hear in imagination the wailings, howlings, shouts, and blasphemies against Christ and his saints, which break forth from thence.

"The third point is, to perceive likewise, by an imaginary smell, the smoke, the brimstone, and the stench as of a sink of filth and rottenness.

"The fourth point is, to taste in like manner things most bitter, as tears, spite, and the worm of conscience.

"The fifth point is, to touch in a manner those flames, by the contact of which the souls themselves are burnt.

"Meanwhile, in colloquy with Christ, the souls of those are to be called to mind, who are condemned to the punishments of hell, either because they would not believe the advent of Christ, or because, although believing, they did not lead a life agreeable to his commandments; and that either before the advent of Christ, or at the time of

his living in this world, or subsequently to that time. Lastly, exceeding thanks are to be given to the same Christ for not having suffered me to sink down into such perdition, but on the contrary, having dealt with me to this day in the greatest loving-kindness and mercy. The exercise is to be closed by saying the *Pater Noster.*" *Exercit. Spirit.* 1*a Hebd.* 5*um Exerc. pp.* 52, 53.

The wretchedness and prostration of soul which it is the object of the exercises of the first week to produce, is increased by a course of penitential and ascetic practices, to be gone through, in combination with the daily contemplations before described, during the intervals between the latter. These consist in an examination of the conscience three times a day, throughout the whole course of the exercises, and mortifications of the flesh by abstinence, scourging, &c., of which no particular account is given, as they are left to the discretion of the spiritual director. The examination is to be had in a general way, under the three heads of transgressions in thought, word, and deed; and in a special manner respecting those sins to which the exercitant is most prone. The method of proceeding for this latter purpose, is singularly mechanical; it is thus prescribed:

"PARTICULAR AND DAILY EXAMINATION, EMBRACING THREE TIMES, ADAPTED TO THE FORMING OF GOOD RESOLUTIONS, AND A TWOFOLD SELF-EXAMINATION.

"The first time is in the morning, when, as soon as the exercitant is risen from sleep, he is to resolve upon keeping a diligent watch upon himself, respecting some particular sin or vice of which he desires to be corrected.

"The second time is in the afternoon, when he is to ask God for grace that he may be able to remember how often he has fallen into that particular sin or transgression, and guard against it in future; then let him enter upon his first examination, requiring an account of his soul touching the aforesaid sin or vice; how often during the different portions of the day that are past, from the hour when he rose, to the present hour, he has committed the same; and let him mark as many dots in the first line of the figure below[7]. Which being done, let him again resolve to restrain himself more diligently during the remaining portion of the day.

"The last time will be in the evening, when, after supper, the second examination is to be instituted, again inquiring into every separate hour, from the former examination to the present; and having in the same way called to mind and counted up the number of times that he has transgressed, he is to mark a similar number of dots in the second line of the figure prepared for the purpose, in accordance with that given below.

[7] A diagram, representing seven pairs of lines gradually shortening, is subjoined to this section of the exercises.

"FOUR ADDITIONS, USEFUL FOR THE EASIER AND READIER EXTIRPATION OF ANY GIVEN SIN OR VICE.

"The first[8] is, that as often as a man has committed that kind of sin or transgression, he should, with his hand placed on his breast, lament his fall; which may be done even in the presence of others without their being aware of it.

"The second is, that counting up at night and comparing with each other the number of the points on the two lines, one of which belongs to the first, and the other to the second examination, he should mark whether any amendment have taken place between the first and the second examination.

"The third is, that he should compare together the examinations of the first and second days, considering whether any amendment have taken place.

"The fourth is, that comparing together the examinations of two weeks, he should in like manner render an account to himself of the improvement which he has made, or else failed to make." *Exercit. Spirit.* 1*a Hebdom. Examen. part. et quotid.* pp. 32, 33.

If this plan had been devised expressly as a short method for "making clean the outside of the cup and of the platter," it could not have been better arranged, seeing that according to this prescription sins and vices of any kind may, if all goes well, be cut down to a very *minimum*, if not wholly eradicated within the space of a week, or a fortnight at the most. What notions of the nature of sin, of its action in the soul of man, and of the difficulty of restraining, not to say "extirpating" it, must they have, to whom such a scheme of self-examination and spiritual improvement can give satisfaction! It must be confessed, however, that it is in perfect keeping with the entire character of the exercises, which amount to nothing more than a piece of mechanical mysticism, devoid of all that truly deserves to be called spiritual[9]. Indeed, by

[8] Against this direction is marked in the margin "*vitii expiatio.*" In what sense is the word expiation to be understood in this place?

[9] One of the most offensive parts of the system, on account of its desecration of things spiritual, by subjecting them to a pedantic mechanism, is developed in the chapter on Prayer. (*Exercit. Spirit. Modi Tres Orandi*, p. 117.) Three modes of prayer are there pointed out. The first consists in a recapitulation of sins, under the following heads: the Ten Commandments, the seven capital sins, the three powers of the soul, and the five senses of the body; with a direction to dwell on each commandment, &c. on an average, as long as it will take to say three *Pater Noster*. The second mode of prayer consists in "ruminating in a sitting or kneeling posture, with eyes fixed on one spot or closed," upon the several words (or clauses, if the single words do not yield a sense,) of the *Pater Noster*, or any other given form of prayer. Here somewhat more liberty is allowed as to the time to be employed in meditating on each several word or clause, provided the whole be completed within an hour. If at the expiration of the hour there remains any portion of the form of prayer which has not been meditated upon, it is to be simply recited, so as to bring the devotion to a close; but in that case the devotion of the following day must be taken up at the same point, reciting the commencement of the same form of prayer down to the word

a striking coincidence, that which alone can impart spirituality in the true sense of the word, the influence, viz. of the Holy Spirit, is not so much as mentioned among the means pointed out for the attainment of the end proposed. With the exception of one or two passages in which the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity are spoken of, and therefore the Holy Ghost by implication, without being expressly named, and the incidental mention of the Holy Ghost in two or three passages of the history of our blessed Lord, the existence of the Third Person of the ever-blessed Trinity is not even alluded to, and the exercitants of St. Ignatius Loyola might almost say with those half-instructed converts at Ephesus, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." The principal stages in the work of redemption, from the incarnation to the ascension, are proposed as subjects of meditation; but that which of all others would have been appropriate in a compendium of spiritual exercises, the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, is passed over in total silence. Of his office to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, to renew and sanctify the soul, to guide us into all truth, and to show us the things of Christ, to help our infirmities, making intercession for us, and to bear witness with our spirit that we are the children of God,

at which the last devotion left off, and then resuming the process of "rumination." The prescription for the third mode of prayer is to the following effect: "Between every two respirations insert one word of the Lord's prayer, or of any other given prayer, pondering meanwhile either the meaning of the word uttered, or the dignity of the person to whom the prayer is addressed, or your own vileness, or lastly, the contrast between these two; and proceed in the same manner with the other words." In this way, word for word, and breath for breath, may be treated at one time the Lord's prayer, at another time the *Ave Maria*, or the *Credo*, or the *Anima Christi*, or the *Salve Regina*; and if any one be particularly devout, he may join two or more of these forms of prayer together, proceeding with them in the manner before stated. The rationale of this devotional mechanism is given in the *Directorium*, (cap. xxxvii. p. 303.) where we are informed, that the use of this method is to accustom men to recite vocal prayer with due attention and devotion, agreeably to the Apostolic precept: "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also;" for which reason this exercise is particularly recommended to "those who are obliged to recite the canonical hours, or other vocal prayers." To this two observations are appended; first with regard to the choice between the three modes of prayer here prescribed; not only, it is said, will one mode suit one person better, and another mode another person, but one and the same person, according as he is in different dispositions of mind or body, will prefer one at one time and another at another time; for instance, if he be tired or ill, and not inclined for long meditation, the second or third mode will be preferable to the first. The other observation is, that it is not intended by this direction to exclude other modes of prayer, which the Holy Ghost may teach, or which experience may suggest. No Jesuit, however, is in any case permitted to adopt any mode of prayer in the least differing from the foregoing prescriptions, without special leave from his superior; to whom he is at all times bound to give a full and particular account of the method he pursues in his devotions. To such miserable bondage is the freedom of access reduced, which we have "through Christ, by the Spirit, unto the Father."

of all this there is not a syllable to be found, from first to last, in these so-called spiritual exercises. The omission is characteristic in the highest degree of a plan of spiritual discipline distinct from that which Christ himself has provided in his Church. Indeed, with all due reverence be it spoken, there does not appear to be any room left in this system for the operation of the Holy Ghost. The conviction of sin is produced by a simple exertion of the memory, aided by the lines and dots before described; for the apprehension of the things of Christ, the "five imaginary senses" are chiefly relied upon; the intercession devolves upon the Virgin Mary, whose aid is invoked again and again, as an introduction to the help of Christ himself, throughout the whole course of the exercises[1]; and the guidance

[1] The author of the "Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine," asserts that in the *Exercitia*, "a work so highly sanctioned, so widely received, so intimately bearing upon the most sacred points of personal religion, *very slight mention occurs of devotion to the blessed Virgin, Mother of God.*" And after referring to several passages of the *Exercitia*, he adds: "And this is *about the whole of the devotion, if it may so be called*, which is recommended towards St. Mary, in the course of so many apparently as a hundred and fifty meditations, and those chiefly on the events in our Lord's earthly history, as recorded in Scripture. *It would seem, then*, that whatever be the influence of the doctrines connected with St. Mary and the Saints in the Catholic Church, at least *they do not impede or obscure the freest exercise and the fullest manifestation of the devotional feelings towards God and Christ.*"—pp. 439, 440. With this exculpatory plea for the Mariolatry of the Romish Church, founded on the *Exercitia*, let the reader compare the following direction given in one of the very passages referred to by Mr. Newman, as a general rule respecting the Colloquies, which are of constant recurrence throughout the exercises. "In the Colloquies it is to be observed (as we have partly explained before) that I ought to treat of, and ask for something agreeable to present circumstances; for instance, as I feel in myself consolation or tribulation; as I am seeking to obtain one virtue or another; as I am intending to make this or that resolution respecting myself; as, again, I desire to be sad or joyful on the subject on which I am meditating. In one word, I ought to ask for that which on a certain point I am most anxious for; and *either* there may be but *one Colloquy addressed to the Lord Christ, or else*, if devotion prompt it, *a threefold one, namely to the Mother, to the Son, and to the Father*, as is delivered in the contemplation of the second week on the three classes, with the note there following."—*Exercit. Spirit.* 3*a Hebd.* 1*a Dies.* 1*a Cont.* p. 99.

The passage here referred to, in the second week, prescribes, in the manner indicated in the contemplation of the two Standards, three Colloquies, i. e. to the blessed Virgin, to Christ, and to the Father. Not only, therefore, is the "Devotion to the Virgin" much more intimately interwoven with the "Spiritual Exercises" than the author of the "Essay on Development" would have his readers believe; but it is moreover clear that it supersedes the honour and worship due to the Third Person of the ever-blessed Trinity; instead of addressing THE FATHER, THE SON, AND THE HOLY GHOST, the disciple of Ignatius Loyola addresses THE MOTHER, THE SON, AND THE FATHER. An undeniable and very characteristic instance this of "development!" But the capability for development is unlimited, and accordingly the Jesuit Bellecius, in his *Medulla Asceseos*, p. 13, informs us that a number of men distinguished for their knowledge and probity, some of whom he mentions by name, "not only fearlessly assert" (which it is not at all difficult to believe), "but satisfactorily prove, *solide probant*" (which it would be curious to see), "that these commentaries of St. Ignatius" (the *Exercitia*) "were written with the finger of God, endued with the unction of the Holy Ghost, *indited by the blessed Virgin*, and

of the soul is transferred in the most absolute sense to the spiritual director, under whose auspices the exercises are gone through. And that advisedly so, if we may judge from the fearful language to which M. de Ravignan commits himself on this subject.

"Those," he says, "who pretend to see in a succouring direction a degrading yoke, do not perceive that they reject the support offered to prevent men from falling into the waves of the torrent; for to precipitate one's self amidst the depths of divine things, to adventure one's self into the vast deserts of contemplation, *without rule, without guide, in order to follow simply the spontaneous impulse and* THE CAPRICE OF INSPIRATION, is to court all *the dangers of extreme illusions, and of the most disastrous follies.*"—*De l'Exist. et de l'Inst. des Jésuites*, p. 23.

Even so! let us beware of the dangers of inspiration; let us mistrust the guidance of the Holy Ghost; let us invoke the Virgin Mary, and commit ourselves to the spiritual mechanism of Loyola, the airy imagery of our own excited senses, and the crafty counsel of a Jesuit director, and we shall be perfectly safe! Can folly, can blasphemy, further go?

Hitherto, we have considered the *Exercitia* in the abstract, with reference to their intrinsic pravity as a means of promoting personal religion; but in order to comprehend their full importance, they must be considered in their connexion with the Institute, as the means of entangling men in the meshes of Jesuitism. That this is the light in which they should be viewed, is expressly stated by M. de Ravignan:

"It is not to be supposed," he says, "that the book of the *Exercitia* was composed with a view to supply holy employment for the leisure of the mind. Their principal object is to produce decision and action. Not only is the past to be repaired, but the future is to be fixed; a decision is to be formed for time and eternity. There is more here than a mere contemplative recreation. The warrior of Pampeluna, who borrowed more than one idea from the profession of arms, has introduced one here: soldiers go through the 'exercise' only to prepare themselves for war.

"This is the reason why in the middle of that holy course a grave deliberation is to be entered upon, in presence of the divine examples

lastly, without one jot of alteration, approved, commended and patronized in a bull by Paul III." The Exercitia themselves go no further than to assert that Loyola was taught them, "not so much from books, as by the unction of the Holy Ghost and internal experience." (*Præfatio ad Lectorem; Exercit. Spirit.* p. 14.) A number of learned Jesuits, men of sterling honesty no doubt, whose word "we may well believe," afterwards discover what Loyola himself was ignorant of, that he wrote them under the dictation of "the most august Queen of Heaven." Such are the truly wonderful effects of "the process of development in ideas."

of Jesus Christ, which determine the *beau idéal* of perfection for all, both for those who are called to an apostolic mode of life, and for those who are called to the life of the world and of the family; the time has now arrived for what the book of the *Exercitia* calls the "election," that is to say, the choice of a state of life. The soul which is as yet free, is now maturely to consider what mode of life it ought to embrace with a view to God's glory, and to a future eternity. It contemplates faithfully the Divine Redeemer, it interrogates itself and prays continually.

"Such is this great business of choosing a state of life; it is the centre of the *Exercitia*, the focus to which every thing converges, the mighty knot to which all our hopes and destinies are tied."—*De l'Ex. et de l'Inst. des Jés.* pp. 23, 24.

The central point of the *Exercitia* here alluded to is the *Meditatio de duobus Vexillis*, which is inserted, as an exceptional exercise, between the meditations on different parts of our Lord's history, on the fourth day of the second week. We despair of doing the subject justice without a literal translation of

"THE MEDITATION CONCERNING THE TWO STANDARDS,

"*The one that of our excellent Captain Jesus Christ, the other that of Lucifer, the most deadly enemy of mankind.*

"The preparatory prayer as usual.

"First prelude, a kind of historical contemplation of Christ on the one side, and Lucifer on the other, both calling upon men to collect under their respective standards.

"Second prelude, for the construction of the place; let there be imagined a very large plain near Jerusalem, and in it the Lord Jesus Christ as the chief captain of all good men; again another plain in Babylonia, with Lucifer, the captain of the wicked and the adversaries.

"Third prelude, to ask for grace that we may be able to discern all the wiles of the evil captain, imploring at the same time the help of God for avoiding them; and further, that it may be given us to know and to imitate the good character of Christ, the true and excellent captain.

"First point, to imagine before my eyes, in the Babylonian plain, the captain of the wicked, sitting on a throne of fire and smoke, of a horrible figure and terrible countenance.

"Second point, to observe how he disperses the innumerable devils congregated around him, throughout the world, to do mischief, not sparing any city or place, or any kind of persons.

"Third point, to observe what kind of speech he makes to his servants, instigating them to take snares and chains and throw them over men, and to drag them first (as is mostly the case) to the love of riches, whence afterwards they may the more easily be forced on to the ambition of worldly honour, and finally to the abyss of pride.

"These are the three principal steps of temptation grounded on

riches, honour, and pride; whence there is a rapid descent to all other kinds of vices.

"Likewise, on the contrary part, our sovereign and excellent ruler and captain Christ is to be contemplated.

"First point, to look upon Christ standing in a pleasant plain close by Jerusalem, in an humble position, but very beautiful in form and most lovely in countenance.

"The second point, to watch in what manner he, the Lord of the whole world, sends his chosen apostles, disciples, and other servants through the world, that they may impart his holy and saving doctrine to every sort, class, and condition of men.

"The third point, to listen to the speech in which Christ exhorts all his servants and friends, destined for this work, and commands them to use their endeavours in assisting others, with a view first of leading them on to a spiritual love of poverty, and moreover (if a regard for Divine obedience, and their heavenly election dispose them that way), to an actual embracing of true poverty; secondly, of luring them into a desire for reproach and contempt, out of which grows the virtue of humility. And thus rise the three steps of perfection, viz.: poverty, abjection of self, and humility, which are diametrically opposed to riches, honour, and pride, and which at once bring in all the other virtues.

"After this a colloquy is to be addressed to the blessed Virgin, and through her grace is to be solicited from her Son, that I may be received and may remain under his standard; and that, first, by poverty, either spiritual only, or else accompanied by the spoiling of goods (that is, if he deign to call and admit me thereto); secondly, by abjection or ignominy, whereby I may the more closely imitate Him, yet deprecating the guilt of others, lest the contempt shewn me should be injurious to any one or offensive to God.

"This first colloquy is to be concluded with an *Ave Maria*.

"A second colloquy is to be addressed to the man Christ, that he may obtain the same things for me from the Father, and at the end the prayer *Anima Christi*[2], is to be added.

"A third colloquy is to be addressed to the Father, that he may grant the petition, concluding with the *Pater Noster*.

"This exercise is to be gone through once at midnight, and a second time at daybreak.

"It is further to be repeated twice, about the time of morning mass

[2] The prayer *Anima Christi* stands at the beginning of the book of the *Exercitia*, with the sensual character of which it entirely harmonizes. It is as follows:—

Anima Christi, sanctifica me.
Corpus Christi, salva me.
Sanguis Christi, inebria me.
Aqua lateris Christi, lava me.
Passio Christi, conforta me.
O bone Jesu! exaudi me:
Intra tua vulnera absconde me;
Ne permittas me separari a te:
Ab hoste maligno defende me:
In hora mortis meæ voca me,
Et jube me venire ad te,
Ut cum sanctis tuis laudem te,
In sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

and of vespers, with the three colloquies added at the end. And before supper the following exercise is to be performed:—

"A MEDITATION TO BE HAD ON THE SAME FOURTH DAY,

"*Concerning the three classes of men, or the differences between them, in order to our embracing the best part.*

"Preparatory prayer as before.

"First prelude, to set before the mind, by way of history, three distinct classes of men, every one of which has gained ten thousand ducats by other means than the worship and love of God; but now desires to be reconciled to God and to be saved, forsaking by all means the hurtful love of the thing gained, as being an obstacle to salvation.

"Second prelude, to construct in imagination some place, in which I may see myself standing before God and all his saints, earnestly desiring to know by what means I may best please God.

"Third prelude, to pray for that which I wish, namely, for grace to choose that which may be both most acceptable to God, and most salutary to myself." *Exercit. Spirit. 2a Hebd. 4a dies.* pp. 77—82.

Then follows the description of the three classes of men; the first being ready to part with their wealth, but delaying till the hour of death; the second trying to combine the possession of their wealth with the service of God; the third, the class in which the exercitant, if he is at all in earnest, must aspire to find himself of those who are ready at once to resign all for God's sake. In an appendix to the second week, a variety of directions are added in reference to the election, which is to be the subject of daily consideration after the exercise of the two standards, until the matter has been brought to a final issue; and in the event of hesitation the spiritual director is empowered to protract the exercises of the second week, by the insertion of additional portions of the Gospel history. How these meditations of the two standards, and of the three classes of men, are brought effectually to bear upon the mind of the exercitant, so as to drive him to the conclusion to which, if he be considered a fit subject, it is the business of the spiritual director to conduct him, will appear yet more clearly on reference to the *Directorium*, a work of consummate subtlety, which was first suggested in the first General Congregation, held after the death of Loyola, in the year 1558, but not executed till the year 1599, when it was completed by Polanco, and circulated by command of General Aquaviva throughout the order, for the guidance of those to whom the management of exercitants should be committed. In the first instance the greatest caution is enjoined in proposing the exercises, to prevent the parties who are induced to go through them, from suspecting that the object is to draw them into the society. (Dir. c. i. § 2, 5; c. iv. § 8.) The time of proposing them is cunningly chosen; it is never to be

done abruptly, but always upon some suitable opportunity, (*aliquâ commodâ occasione, vel è re natâ, vel* DEXTRÈ ACCERSITÂ) ; for instance, if a person appear dissatisfied with his condition, or labour under some scruple of mind, or some difficulties in his circumstances ; if his affairs go on badly, or his friends treat him ill; or if he has fallen into some vicious habits or some great faults, whereby his conscience is troubled,—in all such cases a course of the *Exercitia* is to be recommended, either in the confessional, or out of it. (Dir. c. i. § 3.) The exercitant is required from the first to make up his mind to whatever God may lead him to in the course of the exercises, to look upon his director as upon an instrument sent to him by God, that he may show him the way unto life, and accordingly to make him privy to all his most secret thoughts. (Dir. c. ii. § 5—7.) But while the exercitant thus lays his soul open in the most unreserved manner, the director is to use such reserve as he may see expedient ; not letting him see the whole of the exercises at once, lest he should get frightened, but bringing him on by slow degrees. (Dir. c. ii. § 8.) When at last the exercitant has reached the point at which he is to make his election of a state of life, the director is called upon to put forth all his skill, at one time pressing on towards a decision, at another time holding back and delaying, and if the party hesitates, keeping him under a wretched sense of spiritual desolation, which he is taught to look upon as a punishment inflicted upon him by God for his reluctance to enter into his service. The whole of the rules bearing upon this part of the subject (Dir. c. xxii.—xxxiii.) are contrived with such profound skill, and so deep an insight into human nature, that it is next to impossible that any one who has so far committed himself, should recede. The strength of his mind and will must be considerably broken by the whole course of the exercises from the beginning, and as long as he has not resolved to enter the order at the sacrifice of every other consideration, he cannot, upon the premises to which he has been led to give, under the most solemn sanctions of religion, a hearty and unsuspecting assent, view his own conduct in any other light than as a base and cowardly backwardness to obey the manifest will of God. So much so, that as the *Directorium* observes, persons who have to the last been unable to make up their minds while under the influence of the exercises, which is called the state of "hallucination," are often at a subsequent period brought to the point by the inward dissatisfaction which the whole process leaves behind in their souls, and which they cannot get rid of. Nor is it at all surprising that there should be considerable danger of unsettling the intellect of the exercitant,—a danger to which the *Directorium* draws particular

attention, and prescribes the rules of prudence and discretion necessary to be observed in order to avoid such a result. (Dir. c. viii. § 3.)

We have seen by what methods the unhappy man who is overtaken by some wily Jesuit confessor or director in the evil hour of calamity or of remorse, or, which is the more usual case, the unhappy youth who is laid hold of in the seminary, at the moment when the awakening passions make him a fit subject for this spiritual circumvention, is tortured into persuading himself that it is a duty from which he dares not shrink, at the peril of his soul, to devote himself to the service of God in the order of St. Ignatius Loyola. Let us next ascertain on what terms the admission into the society, which he has been goaded to solicit, is granted him. For this purpose we now turn to the *Constitutions*[3],

[3] Of this formerly scarce work we have three different editions lying before us; one, which forms part of the *Institutum* recently published at Avignon by the Jesuits themselves (No. 1.); another reprinted from the Prague edition of 1757 (the best edition of the Institutum extant) by an anonymous editor, in the interest of the opponents of the Jesuits, at Paris (No. 5.); and the third, which was published in this country some years ago, under the auspices of a clergyman of our Church who has for many years taken a great interest in the questions connected with the Romish controversy, and to whose kindness we are indebted for several of the materials of which we have availed ourselves in the present article. The first of these editions appears, on comparison with the second, to be accurately reprinted from the latest Prague edition (1757) of the *Institutum*. Of this we have not been able to get a sight, the work having become exceedingly scarce; and it is clear that the Avignon edition is not (as we had been informed it was, on the authority of a Jesuit,) a complete and accurate reprint of it. In the Constitutions we have not discovered any discrepancy from the recent Paris edition (No. 5.) which there is no reason to doubt gives the text of the Prague edition faithfully. But in the Exercitia it is evident from the quotations of M. de Ravignan, who used the Prague edition, that the text has undergone various modifications in the Avignon edition; and from the account given of the Prague edition of the *Institutum* in the preface to the Paris edition of the Constitutions, it appears that several parts of it have been altogether omitted by the Avignon editors. The following is a comparative table of the contents of these two editions of the *Institutum*.

Prague Edition, 1757. 2 vols. folio. Vol. I.	Avignon Edition, 1827—38. 7 vols. 8vo. Vol. I.
1. The *ninety-two Papal bulls* granted to the society from its foundation to the year 1757.	1. The *five bulls* granted to the society during the first ten years of its existence by Paul III., and the bull of restoration granted by Pius VII., in the year 1814.
2. The *Compendium Privilegiorum*, being a collection of all the privileges granted by the pope to the Jesuits, and of all those granted to other religious orders, any of which the Jesuit order has, by a special grant from the pope, the right to appropriate.	[*Caret.*]
3. The *Constitutions*, preceded by the *Examen Generale*, with the declarations attached to both.	2. The *Constitutions*, preceded by the *Examen Generale*, with the declarations attached to both.

or the fundamental rules of the order, preceded by the *Examen Generale*, which, in fact, forms part of them.

The unhappy wretch whose moral sense has been effectually

[See vol. II. n. 10.]

[See vol. II. n. 11.]

[*Qu.?*]

[*Qu.?*]

[*Qu.?*]

4. The *Decrees of the XVIII general congregations*, held down to the year 1757.

5. The *Canons* enacted by the different congregations.

6. The *Indiculus Decretorum*, or general table of the decrees of the congregations.

Vol. II.

7. The *Censuræ* and *Præcepta* or penal statutes and precepts to be read at table at certain periods.

8. The *Formulæ Congregationum*, or rules for convening general and provincial congregations.

9. The *Officium Vicarii Generalis*, and *Regulæ Assistentium &c.*; or rules for the administration of the different offices of the order.

10. The *Summarium Constitutionum.*

11. The *Regulæ.*

12. The *Ratio Studiorum*, or body of regulations relative to the instruction imparted by the order.

13. The *Ordinationes Generalium* or orders of generals collected by decree of the VIIth congregation.

14. The *Instructiones* out of which the preceding was collected, printed by order of the VIIth congregation, but not having force of law.

15. The *Industriæ ad curandos animi morbos*, by general Aquaviva.

Vol. II.

3. The *Summarium Constitutionum*, or abstract of the preceding work.

4. The *Regulæ*, or rules, both those which are to be observed by all in common, and those which regulate the administration of the different offices, from the provincial down to the cook and watchman; extracted from the Constitutions.

5. The *Epistle of St. Ignatius* on the virtue of obedience.

6. The *Monita Generalia* collected from different orders of the generals and decrees of the congregations, by authority of the VIth, and enlarged by authority of the XVIth general congregation.

7. The *forms of the vows* taken by the different grades of members.

Vols. III. and IV.

8. The *Decrees of the XXI general congregations*, the last of which was held in the year 1829.

Vol. V.

9. The *Canons* enacted by the first XI congregations.

10. The *Indiculus Decretorum*, or general table of the decrees of the congregations down to the XXIst.

11. The *Censuræ* and *Præcepta.*

12. The *Formulæ Congregationum.*

13. The *Officium Vicarii Generalis*, and *Regulæ Assistentium &c.*

[See vol. II. n. 3.]
[See vol. II. n. 4.]

[*Caret.*]

[See vol. VII. n. 17.]

[See vol. VII. n. 18.]

[See vol. VI. n. 16.]

suffocated[4] by the *Exercitia*, crosses the threshold of the house of probation; he presents himself for the preliminary trial. He is

	Vol. VI.
16. The *Exercitia Spiritualia.*	14. The *Exercitia Spiritualia.*
17. The *Directorium.*	15. The *Directorium.*
[See above, 15.]	16. The *Industriæ ad curandos animi morbos.*
	Vol. VII.
[See above, 13.]	17. The *Ordinationes Generalium.*
[See above, 14.]	18. The *Instructiones.*
	An *Index Generalis* to the seven volumes closes this edition.

On reviewing this comparative table, it appears that the Prague edition comprises all that is contained in the Avignon edition, with the exception of the decrees of the general congregations held subsequently to the year 1757; the few pieces marked [*Qu?*] being in all probability omitted on account of their smallness by the Paris editor, though contained in the Prague edition. On the contrary, it appears that the Avignon edition omits altogether two documents, the *Compendium Privilegiorum*, which it might not be prudent to obtrude on the world at this early period of the Society's revival, and the *Ratio Studiorum.* The omission of the latter is accounted for by the 15th decree of the XXIst general congregation, from which it appears that at the XXth congregation, held in the year 1820, it was proposed that the *Ratio Studiorum* should be revised and *adapted to the present time.* The subject having again been brought forward in the next congregation, the general stated that he was fully impressed with the necessity of the measure, and determined to apply himself to it; but that it required in his opinion much consideration, and that he did not think any thing ought to be proposed by way of general rule, until it had been subjected to the test of experience. To this view of the general the congregation warmly assented, and the educational movements of the Jesuits are therefore to be considered, for the present, experimental. It was, we are ready to admit, a wise and prudent thought to try first how much the world will bear at their hands in that line, and above all, to give their opponents no handle by a premature prospectus of their doings.

After this full account of the two editions of the Institute, we have room for a few words only on the two editions of the Constitutions before mentioned. The edition published in 1838 by Messrs. Rivington, the first English edition of the Constitutions, is a reprint of the Latin text of the first edition (in which the *Examen Generale* and the declarations are not comprised) printed at the society's press at Rome in the year 1558; to this reprint is added a collation of that text with the Antwerp edition of 1702, a copy of which is in the University library at Cambridge. The text of the Prague edition, and of the Paris and Avignon editions, recently printed from it, corresponds with that of the Antwerp edition, and seems to be that finally settled by the 59th decree of the IVth general congregation (1581), as a proposal for further correction made in the Vth, and referred to the VIth congregation, was quashed by the latter. The English edition contains, besides, an English translation, both of the Constitutions and of the three bulls by which the order was founded by Paul III. in 1540, suppressed by Clement XIV. in 1773, and restored by Pius VII. in 1814. An "Outline of the present condition of the Romish Church in this Kingdom," originally appended to a sermon preached by the bishop of Australia, closes the volume.

The Paris edition of the Constitutions (No. 5) accompanies the reprint of the Latin text by a new French translation, that made in 1762 by order of the Dauphin being in the opinion of the editor unsatisfactory. It also contains Loyola's famous letter on the virtue of obedience, with a translation, and in an appendix a series of valuable notes illustrative of different parts of the Constitutions, chiefly by reference to other parts of the *Institutum.*

[4] This is no rhetorical figure of ours; the *Directorium* so describes the process: "*Natura ipsa, præsertim in iis qui timidiores sunt et pusillanimes, in illâ quasi agoniâ quodammodo opprimitur et suffocatur.*"—Direct. c. xxxiii. § 3.

first subjected to a searching examination touching his past history, his position in the world, his family and connexions, his circumstances, his bodily and mental constitution, and other points upon consideration of which the society decides how far he may make a good Jesuit. This is fair enough; if a man is not likely to answer its purpose, the society has a right to say that it will have nothing to do with him; though it may seem hard to shut him out from what, according to the representation of the Jesuits themselves, is the royal road to Christian perfection. If, on the contrary, the candidate is thought worthy, the terms of admission to the novitiate are communicated to him. These are as follows:—He is to dispose of all his property, actual and reversionary, by application of the surplus, after the payment of his just debts, to pious and charitable uses; practically, for the most part, in favour of the order of Jesuits, which undertakes the office of Great Almoner for its deluded victims. This disposal of property is to be made either on entering upon the novitiate, or at all events after the expiration of the first year, at any moment that the superior may command it to be done; and that without any reservation in favour of his relatives[5]. Though he may decline to strip himself at once of all his property, he is not to retain any money in his hands, nor to deposit money with any person whatever; but to place all the money he has in the hands of the cashier of the novitiate. He is never to go out of the house without permission from the superior, and then as a rule only with a companion, chosen not by him but for him; and in the house he is only permitted to converse, and that but sparingly, with particular individuals pointed out to him for that purpose. He is not to hold any communication personally, or by letter,

[5] "In order," says the *Examen*, "that they may yield more perfect obedience to the Gospel, which says not, 'give to your relations,' but 'give to the poor;'" ["IT IS CORBAN!!" Mark vii. 11.] "and that they may set to all a better example of laying aside all inordinate affection towards relatives," ["WITHOUT NATURAL AFFECTION!!" 2 Tim. iii. 3.] "and of avoiding the inconveniences of an inordinate distribution arising from this affection; and moreover, that they may the more firmly and stably persevere in their vocation, all recourse to parents and other relations being cut off, and the very recollection of them become useless, (*ad parentes et consanguineos recurrendi, et ad inutilem ipsorum memoriam aditu præcluso.*")—*Exam. Gen.* c. iv. § 2. The rigidity with which these terms are enforced is incredible; none but a Jesuit can insist on such a bargain. We know a case of recent occurrence in this country, in which a young man who was not only most anxious to join the order, but was already more than half accepted, was harshly repelled, simply because he had too much heart to suffer his aged father, who had a wife and daughter to support by his exertions as a trader, to make the sacrifice of nearly half his little property, to be paid down in ready money, the price which the Jesuits had actually prevailed upon him to offer for his son's admission. The young man afterwards went to the English college at Rome, and is now one of the Romish clergy of the London district: his refusal by the Jesuits left for years after an impression of deep melancholy upon his mind.

with any of his friends or relatives, unless on a special emergency, with the permission of the superior; and in that case he is to put any letters which he may write or receive, into the hands of his superior, on the understanding that he is to forward or to suppress them as he sees fit. He is to lay aside all natural affection [6] towards relatives, and to resign all friendships. He is to be content to have all his faults reported to his superiors, and in like manner to report those of others [7]. Upon these terms, and a

[6] Again, ἄστοργοι. The passage, Luke xiv. 26. is perverted to support this atrocious injunction; and by way of making compliance with it easier, the following prescription is given:—"In order that the expression may come in aid of the sentiment, it is a holy counsel that they should accustom themselves to say, not 'We *have* parents, or brethren;' but 'We *had* parents or brethren.'" *Examen Gen.* c. iv. *Decl.* C.

[7] The rules upon which this horrible system of universal mutual *espionage* rests, are laid down with admirable *naïveté*. "For the greater advancement in spirituality, and especially for the more effectual promotion of submission and humility in the individual himself, every one must be content to have all his faults and defects, and whatever else has been noticed or observed in him, reported to the superiors by every one who has become acquainted with them otherwise than in the confessional."—"All are to be content to be corrected by means of their neighbours, and to assist in their correction, and to be ready to report each other, in all due love and charity, for their greater spiritual advancement; especially if this be enjoined and required by the superior who has charge of them, for the greater glory of God." *Summ. Constit. Reg.* IX. & X. A feeling of repugnance against this system, which is not confined to the pupils and the novices, but pervades the entire order, reaching even the general himself, by means of his admonitor and assistants, appears to have gained ground at one time in the society; for in the sixth congregation these rules were sharply canvassed; but General Aquaviva was wide awake for the interests of the order, and took care that no ambiguity should remain on the subject. It was therefore settled, that it is lawful for all to report to the superior as to a father, every fault of his neighbours, whether serious or trifling; and that this is the meaning of the rule; that by agreeing to the terms proposed in the fourth chapter of the *Examen*, the members of the society renounce every right in regard to their good name, which might stand in the way of this system of reporting, and give to all permission to inform the superior of every thing, important or unimportant, which may have been noticed in them; that although, generally speaking, confidential communications voluntarily made by one to another under the seal of secrecy, though not in confession, are not to be included under this rule, yet if he who has received such a communication should for some grave reasons doubt whether he ought not to divulge it, he is to look diligently into the opinions of the doctors, and thereupon to act as he shall see fit; that the express order or demand of the superior is not to be waited for, but that the members are to report each other voluntarily, without being required to do so; that in matters likely to lead to mischievous consequences, and more especially in cases of evil speaking, murmuring, or discontent against the superiors, it is an imperative duty to give immediate information, and that equally with a view either to moral discipline, or, if the case require it, to judicial proceedings. It was further determined, as regards the use to be made of information so secretly obtained by the superior, that he is never to give up the name of his informant without his consent, which, however, the latter may at times be bound to give; that he is in every possible way to bear his informant harmless; neither is he, if it can be avoided, to allow the information itself to transpire; nor in any case to make it known farther than is necessary with a view to the application of a remedy; that superiors are to communicate freely with each other on the information they receive concerning those placed under them; that the superior is

general promise of submission to his superiors in all things, he is admitted to the novitiate, which lasts two years, and is passed, to the exclusion of study or any other occupation which might help to sustain, satisfy, or enlarge the mind, in the repetition of spiritual exercises, in the examination of the constitutions of the society, or rather of such parts of them as it may be judged expedient to show him, (*Exam. Gen.* c. i. *Decl.* G.,) and in the practice of the one and all-sufficient virtue of the Jesuit, obedience. For the more effectual exercise of the latter, the novice is during the first year of his novitiate subjected to various probations, such as the following:—To serve for a month or two as attendant in a hospital; to travel without money, begging his way; to fill the lowest situations in the household, to assist in cooking and sweeping the house, and to perform other menial offices; to instruct young children and ignorant persons; and to be content with the worst possible fare. In whatever situation he may find himself, and whosoever may be placed over him for the time, even though it should be one of the household servants, to whom he is assigned as an assistant, he is to show to this his temporary superior all due reverence, and to "obey his commands, as if they came from the lips of our Lord Jesus Christ himself." The novice is to confess, and to receive the holy sacrament once a week, on pain of having his food withheld from him, (*si ad Confessionem non accederent, subtrahatur eis cibus corporis, donec cibum spiritus sumant.* Const. Pars iii. c. i. Decl. Q.) Within three months after his entrance he is to make a general confession of his whole life, and this is to be repeated from the point last arrived at, from six months to six months. He is of course bound to submit to all

in no case to require his informant to give the information in writing, as that might expose him to judicial proceedings; that the superior is to proceed against the person denounced not only by private admonition, by threats, by stricter surveillance, but also by removal, by deprivation of office and the like; that in minor cases the superior may make the matter a subject of public reprehension in the refectory, saving the person informed against, but above all the informer, as much as possible; that in cases of a more serious nature, the superior may, upon such private information, even proceed to expulsion from the order, provided it be done quietly and upon some plausible pretence. Lastly, to soften the odiousness of the system, an appeal is made to the rules of the Franciscans and Minorites, and more particularly to a decree of St. Bonaventura, which, however, only declares that the fact of his participation in crime does not relieve the accomplice from the obligation of giving information to the superior. *Decr. Congr.* VI. 49 & 50 *passim.* It is worthy of observation, as showing the extent to which the French clergy of the present day are imbued with the principles of Jesuitism, that the vile system of secret spiritual police here recommended, has been adopted on a large scale by the French Bishops with regard to the unhappy *desservants*, and has borne such abundant fruit that, according to the statement of the *Frères Allignol*, in their work *de l'Etat actuel du Clergé en France*, "secret accusations have in all the dioceses been multiplied beyond measure, and that in some dioceses there is not a single priest who has not at one time or another been denounced."

the rules of the society, and also to undergo without murmuring the different penances which his confessors and his superiors may prescribe to him from time to time; as well as to endure, without murmur or complaint, any ill-treatment, defamation, or indignity to which he may be subjected. Lastly, at the expiration of the two years, he is questioned as to the state of his mind, and the spiritual desires after perfection which he experiences; if he should answer unsatisfactorily, he is asked next, whether he feels in himself at least a desire to feel such desires? By this means, and by a continuance of ascetic practices, he is generally brought at last to answer in the affirmative, and is then, on taking the three vows of obedience, poverty, and chastity, formally admitted as a member of the order, and put under further training for whatever station in it the superiors may consider most suitable to him. *Examen Generale*, c. iv. *passim. Constit. Pars* iii. c. i. *passim.*

Having conducted the unhappy novice thus far, let us pause for a moment and realize his situation. Under the influence of religious excitement, real or factitious, he has taken the fatal step of cutting from under him all the supports with which a kind Providence had surrounded him, and cast himself into the arms of a body, of whose immense power he had often heard, and by whose iron grasp he now feels himself crushed. Excitement does not last for ever; the hour of reflection arrives in its turn; a sense of disappointment begins to creep over him. At first he resists it; but it returns again and again; recollections of his former life, of his friends and his family, crowd in upon him; with them his heart felt warm and happy; here all is icy coldness around him, and deep indescribable misery within. The thought suggests itself that he has been too hasty, that he has taken a false step, that he has been mistaken as to the character of the order with which he has connected himself, or, at any rate, that he has formed an erroneous estimate of his own fitness for such a life. At first he seeks to suppress that too; but it rises again and again; the experience, the bitter, desolating experience of every day and hour goes to confirm it. He becomes more and more deeply convinced that he has fooled away his life's happiness, and, what is far worse, possibly his eternal salvation; for he feels that spiritual improvement is impossible in a situation against which his whole being revolts. He looks forward upon what lies before him, upon the vows which he is to take, the obedience which he is to promise, the uncertainty of the employment to which he will hereafter be put, by the arbitrary decision of those under whose cold, hypocritical tyranny he is already suffering so much. He sees that he must unavoidably become more and more deeply entangled in the meshes of the net in

which he has been caught; that he is hopelessly and for ever the abject slave of a pitiless system; and to work up his indignant sense of the situation in which he is placed, to the highest pitch, he remembers, and is told time after time, that all this is expressly *ad majorem Dei gloriam.*

Might he not retrace his steps? What would he not give, if he had a friend with whom he might consult! Perhaps his confessor or his superior might give him good advice? They treat it all as the rebellion of the old Adam, which must be repressed; they inflict penances, but do not produce conviction. He looks around him, but there is no friend whom he could trust. If he were to open his lips to any of the associates which have been assigned him, the chances are that he would be reported to the superior as a bad subject, as a breeder of discontent and mutiny against the order. The false and unnatural language which he has been taught to make use of by way of spiritual exercise, now returns upon him in bitter reality: "I *had* a father, a mother, friends, relatives!" Could he but take counsel with them! but that is impossible. If he were to write to them, his letter probably would never reach them. Or, if it did, how is he to know that they would sympathise with him? If they approved the step he took, they will blame him; if they disapproved it, they may not be disposed to pity him. Possibly they may love him still; possibly they would assist him; but how is he ever to know? Suppose he were to make his escape. But how shall he manage it? He has not a farthing at his disposal. If he fail, he will be sent he knows not whither, and subjected he knows not to what punishment. If he succeed, what is to become of him? Like a dead man returned from the grave, he will scare men by his very look, and whithersoever he goes, the curse of excommunication will follow him[8]. What then is he to do? Finding himself thus fenced round on every side, his living soul immured as it were within the more than stone walls of the order, he may perhaps for a time secretly indulge a raving mood, approaching even to blasphemy at the remembrance of the oft repeated phrase *ad majorem Dei gloriam;* but as madmen, after fruitlessly knocking their heads against their prison walls, grow tranquil from very exhaustion, so will it happen to him; he will sink down into a state of mental and moral prostration. Then, probably, the thought of that God in whose name he has been so fearfully abused, will occur to him; he will seek to calm the storms of his soul by prayer to Him who

[8] Fugitivi societatis ipso facto excommunicationem incurrunt. *Cong. Gen.* ix. *Can.* ii. cf. *Decr.* xxxix.

is the refuge of the oppressed. Prayer? oh, torment of hell! even that is not sacred in this fearful place. He will have to render an account of every hour he spent on his knees, and either have to tell a lie as in the presence of God, or else, if he suffer the least hint of his secret sorrows and his unbosomings to the Father of Spirits to escape him, he will be interdicted this last refuge of the oppressed soul, and referred back to "ruminations" and "respirations." Where is the man of a thousand, nay, of ten thousands, that would venture to affirm that his moral courage and energy, even though he be in the fulness of his strength, would rise superior to the horrors of such a situation? And how shall a youth rise above them, whose strength has been broken before it has come to its ripeness? or the weary pilgrim, who took refuge in the novitiate, because his soul was longing for rest and peace? Of the immense majority of men it may with perfect certainty be predicted, that under the influence of this discipline they will become, what the system is confessedly intended to produce, dry sticks and dead corpses[9], mere passive tools, yielding themselves instinctively to the impulse of the power that holds and wields them.

This feature of the system of Loyola, that it is a process of spiritual homicide, we hold to be a very important point; one to which sufficient prominence has not, so far as we know, been given by those, who have written upon the dangerous character of the order. In the first place, it accounts for what on no other supposition appears credible, the compactness of villany to which the thousands of puppets, of which the order is composed, are easily made subservient, whenever it may suit those who pull the wires in the eternal city; in the second place it throws immense light upon the debasement of mind and character which must inevitably diffuse itself wherever that order obtains extensive influence in the education of a people; a conclusion strikingly borne out by the decay of the national mind and character in all those countries in which the Jesuits succeeded in establishing themselves as the instructors of the nation; and, lastly, it goes to the very root of the iniquity with which the order is chargeable, viz., that it kills and destroys by its wily machinery that which it is the will of God should be quickened and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. The last consideration is chiefly interesting to the theologian, enabling him

[9] Sibi quisque persuadeat, quod qui sub Obedientiâ vivunt, se ferri ac regi a Divinâ providentiâ per Superiores suos sinere debent, *perinde ac si cadaver essent,* quod quoquoversus ferri, et quâcumque ratione tractari se sinit; vel *similiter atque senis baculus,* qui ubicumque et quâcumque in re velit eo uti, qui eum manu tenet, ei inservit. *Constit. Pars* vi. c. i. § 1.

to form a decisive judgment on the subject, independently of all the secondary points upon which the controversy respecting the merits and demerits of the Jesuits usually turns. The first consideration concerns the historian, who finds it often difficult, with the clearest evidence of facts in his hands, to gain credence for the tale of enormous wickedness which he has to tell when he comes to chronicle the doings of the Jesuits; as a conspiracy of so many and so devoted individuals to work out an evil purpose, appears to the ordinary apprehension and the common charity of mankind too monstrous a supposition to be true. The second of the considerations named is of the utmost importance to the politician, who may be called upon to decide, as our legislators are at this present crisis, whether it be lawful for any state to hand over the rising generations of the land, or any portion of them, to a corporation whose whole system is calculated, and with the most consummate skill adapted, to destroy in man all that makes him a man, and renders him capable of being made a Christian. And all this with what view? With no other view than to level all opposition against the anti-christian usurpation of Rome, whose tool Jesuitism has been from its beginning, and has finally become its last and only resource. Nothing short of the most absolute resignation of both the will and the judgment can render any man a trustworthy instrument of Rome and of its manifold and offensive corruptions. That resignation is attained in the Jesuit order, as under no other system of training or discipline, and it is what in Jesuit language is called "obedience."

"What I have thus spoken concerning obedience," says the celebrated epistle of Ignatius, "is to be observed alike by private members towards their immediate superiors, by the rectors, and local superiors towards the provincials, by the provincials towards the general, and by the general himself towards him whom God has set over him, his vicar on earth; so that a perfect distinction of orders, and thereby peace and charity, may be maintained, without which it is impossible to preserve the good government either of our society or of any other association. For in this way does Divine Providence order all things sweetly, leading on the lowest things by things middle, middle things by the highest, and all things to its own ends. Hence that subordination of one angelic hierarchy under another; hence the connexion by which the heavenly and other moveable bodies are linked together in their several positions, whose changes and motions all descend in regular order from one highest movent to the very lowest. Even so on earth also the like is seen, both in every state ruled by good laws, and especially in the ecclesiastic hierarchy, all the members and functions of which are derived from the one general vicar of Christ our Lord: and the more accurately this order and arrangement is adhered

to, the righter and the better is the government. How grievous ills on the contrary are brought upon many human societies by neglect of this order, is most evident. And therefore do I most ardently wish, that in this society, whereof the Lord has committed to us some charge and care, this virtue may so diligently be practised, and flourish, as if therein consisted the well-being and the entire safety of our Society." *Epist. S. P. N. Ignatii de virt. obed.* § 20.

This was the fundamental principle of Loyola, not to found a particular order, in which individuals might practise a particular rule of religious life, but to create an instrument, compact and powerful, for the maintenance of the Romish hierarchy. Upon the attainment of this object, that admirably contrived code of laws to which we must once more call the attention of our readers, the Constitutions, is calculated. The general of the order resides at Rome[1]; at Rome the General Congregations are held[2]; at Rome, therefore, both the legislative and the executive powers of the society are concentrated. From Rome, as the centre, the chain of the order is laid around the earth with iron links, riveted together by the vow of blind, unquestioning obedience.

The general holds in his hands the most absolute means of control over the movements of this Papal militia in every quarter of the globe. Not only are reports periodically sent from every point at which the society has a station of any kind, to the provincials, and from them to the general, but the local superiors and the missionaries in all parts of the world are also in direct communication with the general, who thus receives constantly a double set of reports, some of which are official, and laid by him before the board of assistants, others secret (with the inscription *soli*), which are read by none but the general himself and the secretary of the order. Lists of all the members of the society, with notes on their character, conduct, abilities, &c., are likewise sent at regular intervals, so as to enable the general to keep a complete survey of the instruments at his command, and of the materials he has to work upon[3]. The property of the order[4] is all vested in the general, the provincials and local

[1] Constit. Pars viii. c. i. § 7, c. v. § 1.
[2] Constit. Pars viii. c. v. § 1.
[3] Constit. Pars viii. c. i. § 9. Decl. L. M. N.
[4] One of the most curious of the many evasions by which the society escapes, as it were, from the operation of its own rules, is the combination of the profession of poverty both individual and corporate, with the possession of immense wealth. The contrivance is this: The professed houses are mendicant establishments, and can hold no property; the colleges on the contrary can accept gifts and endowments, and acquire property to any amount: the general, who is at the head of both, is thus at once a beggar, and a rich proprietor; a beggar, as the chief of a mendicant order; a rich proprietor, as the trustee general of all the endowments of the society's

superiors acting in all financial matters by procuration from him, and agreeably to his direction; with this only restriction, that the dissolution of any college, and consequent appropriation of its revenues to other purposes, and the transfer of property from one province to another, requires the concurrence of the general congregation[5]. And as over the property, so is the general's authority supreme over the persons belonging to the society. The power of admission both to the novitiate, and to the society itself, is inherent in him, and is exercised by others only as his representatives, and in common cases. Cases which present any special difficulty, must be referred to the general. Those to whom the power of admission is ordinarily delegated, are the provincials, the rectors of colleges, and superiors of houses[6]. With the exception of the four assistants and the admonitor, who are, like himself, elected by the general congregation[7], the general appoints all the great officers and other functionaries of the society; the offices of provincial, local superior, and rector, are generally held for three years; but they may at any time be revoked by the general[8]. He has complete power over the employment of all the members, whom he can order to pursue particular studies, to execute special missions, to go forth as preachers, confessors, or missionaries into any part of the world, the general's command being at any moment sufficient to effect the most complete change in the position, the station, and occupation of every member of the society[9]. He exercises over them all a sovereign penal and dispensing power, including that of expulsion and re-admission[1]; for so absolute is his sway, that he is not bound by the acts of those who hold his commission for any given purpose, but may at any time rescind or modify their determinations, according to his good pleasure, which is law to the whole society, and to all

colleges. The amount of the society's wealth may be judged of from the fact, that at the time of its expulsion from France the property of the order within the territory of France alone amounted to 58 millions of francs. The endowed colleges were always the most numerous. At the end of the 16th century the society had 21 professed houses and 293 colleges, that is to say, as M. Quinet shrewdly observes, 21 hands for refusing and 293 for accepting wealth. There is an amusing slip of the pen in one of the decrees (the 58th) of the 2nd general congregation, the society being placed in contradistinction with the *veri Christi pauperes.*

[5] Constit. Pars iv. c. ii; c. x. § 1—3. Pars ix. c. iii. § 5—7, 17; besides a number of decrees passed in the general congregations on this subject.

[6] Constit. Pars i. c. i. § 1. and 2. Decl. B.; c. ii. Decl. c.; Pars ix. c. iii. § 1. Decl. A.

[7] Constit. Pars ix. c. iv. § 4; c. v. § 2, 3.

[8] Constit. Pars ix. c. iii. § 14—16; Decl. I. K.

[9] Constit. Pars ix. c. iii. § 2; Pars vii. c. i. § 2; c. ii. Pars ix. c. iii. § 9. Decl. F. G. H.

[1] Constit. Pars ix. c. iii. § 11; § 8; Decl. D.; Pars ii. c. i. § 2; Pars ix. c. iii. § 1; Ordin. Gener. c. xii.; Constit. Pars ii. c. iv. § 1, 5.

its members, on the ground that he is to them in the place of Christ[2].

Such are the gigantic powers wielded by that irresponsible[3] spiritual despot, the general of the order of Jesuits. But who are his subjects? This is a question far more difficult to answer than might at first sight appear. Ostensibly[4] they are:—

1. The professed Jesuits under obligation of four vows, *Professi quatuor Votorum*, *i. e.*, of obedience, poverty, and chastity, and of special obedience to the Pope respecting the missions; who alone have an absolute right to sit and vote in the general congregation, and by whom exclusively the general is elected. Their number is exceedingly small in comparison with that of the other members. At Loyola's death there were not more than forty professed Jesuits, while the numerical force of the order exceeded one thousand[5].

2. The professed Jesuits under obligation of three vows only, *Professi trium Votorum*, viz., those of obedience, poverty, and chastity; an exceptional grade, conferred upon laymen as well as priests, as a special favour, by virtue of a bull of Julius III. There is reason to suppose that this class comprises what are called *Jésuites de robe courte*, that is, incorporated members who do not avow their connexion with the order, and have dispensation to live in conformity with the world; a position occupied chiefly by men of influence and high standing, who can serve the interests of the society more effectually than if they were to make open profession of Jesuitism; they may be called to sit and vote in general congregations, but not for the election of the general[6].

[2] Constit. Pars ix. c. iii. § 20. The following provision connected with this power of the general, is remarkably characteristic of the spirit of the order. "Although the general may, in his letters patent addressed to the provincials and other local superiors, commit to them the most extensive powers, in order that their inferiors may treat them with the greater reverence, and conduct themselves with the more submission and humility, yet he may by secret letters circumscribe and limit the powers so conferred to any extent that he may think expedient."—*Constit. Pars* ii. c. i. *Decl.* B.

[3] It is true that the constitutions contain certain provisions for controlling the general in the exercise of his power, and in certain cases calling him to account, and even removing him from his office. (*Constit. Pars* ix. c. iv. v.) But it is difficult to understand how, with the despotic power possessed by the general, these provisions can ever be brought to bear; and it is a remarkable fact, that in the only two instances throughout the whole history of the society, in which the general was interfered with, it was done for the maintenance of the corruptions of the order against contemplated reforms.

[4] Constit. Pars v. c. i. Decl. A.

[5] Constit. Pars v. c. ii. § 1, 2, c. iii. § 2—4; Pars viii. c. iii. Decl. A., Crétineau-Joly, vol. i. p. 362.

[6] There is an evident mystery about this class of members. Its institution dates of the year 1550, when it was provided for in a bull of Julius III. by an exceptional

3. The formed Spiritual Coadjutors, *Coadjutores formati spirituales*, an inferior grade to that of the *Professi quatuor Votorum*. A lower degree of qualification, and a shorter time of probation, is required for their admission; they take the three

clause; "*præter aliquos, qui de licentiâ Præpositi Generalis, propter ipsorum* DEVOTIONEM ET PERSONARUM QUALITATEM, *tria vota hujusmodi solemnia facere poterunt.*" Bulla Julii III. Exposcit debitum. In the text of the Constitutions they are thus described: —"*Præter hos* (*professos quatuor votorum*) *nonnulli ad trium votorum solemnium tantum professionem admitti possent: raro tamen, et* NON SINE CAUSIS PECULIARIBUS ALICUJUS MOMENTI: *et hos septem annos in societate notos fuisse, et* NON MEDIOCREM SUI TALENTI AC VIRTUTUM SATISFACTIONEM, *ad gloriam Dei præbuisse in eâ oportebit;*" and in the declaration, "*Qui ad professionem trium votorum solemnium admittuntur, ordinarie sufficientiam in litteris, quæ saltem ad confessarii munus bene obeundum satis sit, habeant oportet;* VEL CERTÈ, DONA DEI ALIQUA RARA, QUÆ ID COMPENSARE VIDEANTUR, *ita ut Præpositus Generalis, vel alius, cui suas vices ad hoc ille* SPECIALI COMMISSIONE *concederet, ad majus Dei obsequium et* SOCIETATIS BONUM, *sic convenire judicaret. Et hi ut plurimum homines erunt, qui* PROPTEREA QUOD BENE MERITI SINT, ET VALDE DEVOTI, *quamvis* MINORI DOCTRINA AC CONCIONANDI APTITUDINE PRÆDITI, *quam nostrum Institutum in professis requirat, admittendi esse in Domino videbuntur.*" —Constit. Pars v. c. ii. § 3, Decl. c.—From this last description one might at first sight be led to suppose that they differed from the *Professi quatuor Votorum* only by the inferiority of their literary and theological attainments, and were professed priests, destined for what the Jesuits consider the lower walk of the sacerdotal office, and especially for the office of confessors. This, however, is palpably contradicted by the fact that the hearing of confessions is one of the principal employments of the *Coadjutores Spirituales* (Exam. c. vi. § 2.), who in all respects answer to the inferior sacerdotal grade; and on weighing the words of Decl. c. more accurately, it appears that it does not say they shall be employed as confessors, but only have the *same degree of literary attainment* as that required of confessors. It is nowhere said that they shall be necessarily in holy orders, and it is evident from the various expressions which we have marked, that they are a class of members, specially created *for certain important objects*, on the ground of their being by *their singular devotion* to the interests of the society, and *their personal quality*, likely to render eminent services. They might therefore be both secular ecclesiastics incorporated in the society, and allowed by special dispensation, and for the more effectual furtherance of the society's objects, to retain their preferment (an arrangement perfectly compatible with the rules of the society), and laymen of distinguished talents and station, admitted into the society upon account of their ability and willingness to advance its interests. We are confirmed in this view by the mystification of M. Crétineau-Joly's language in regard to them. While he states that their employment is the same as that of the spiritual coadjutors (which remains to be proved), he says that they are admitted to profession "*à cause de quelque autre qualité ou d'un mérite dont l'ordre peut tirer parti dans un certain cercle d'idées.*" Vol. i. p. 62. What is the meaning of "*un certain cercle d'idées?*" or rather what *cercle d'idées* is there, in which a spiritual coadjutor may not be employed by his superiors if they see fit, without lifting him out of his class, an honour to which he is expressly forbidden from aspiring? (See Exam. c. vi. § 5. Constit. Pars v. c. iv. § 5.) Or, if his superiors should, on account of his distinguished merits, see fit to advance him, what is there to prevent his being promoted to the class of the *Professi quatuor Votorum?* On the whole, by far the most probable interpretation of this mysterious passage of the Constitutions is that above given; it was first suggested by Ripert de Monclar, who was *procureur-général* at the parliament of Provence, about the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits from France, and in his *Compte rendu* (1 vol. 12mo. 1765) gave a lucid abstract of the laws of the society. See *Constitutions des Jésuites. Paris*, 1843. *Append. note L.* The form of the vow taken by the *Professi trium Votorum* will be found in *Constit.* p. v. c. iii. § 5, 6.

vows only, but must be in holy orders. They are employed as assistants to the professed Jesuits, and generally the rectors and professors of colleges are chosen out of this class. They may, like the *Professi trium Votorum*, be summoned to the general congregation by the general, but cannot take any part in his election [7].

4. The Simple Spiritual Coadjutors, *Coadjutores Spirituales*, a transition grade, from which, after two years' probation, they are promoted to that of Formed Spiritual Coadjutors [8].

5. The Formed Temporal Coadjutors, *Coadjutores formati temporales.* These are the lay administrators and servants of the order, employed in the management of its temporal affairs, and in the performance of the various domestic offices; they are forbidden, if literates, from aspiring to the priesthood, and if unlettered, as most of them are, from learning even to read. They are bound by the three vows [9].

6. The Simple Temporal Coadjutors, *Coadjutores Temporales*, probationers for the foregoing class [1].

7. The Approved Scholars, *Scholastici Approbati*, who are not properly members of the order, but rather aspirants to the membership. They are separated from the novitiate by the three vows which they have taken, and are in training for the degrees of coadjutors, or professed members, as may seem fit to their superiors [2].

8. The Novices, *Novitii*, who have placed themselves under the direction of the order with a view to entrance into it, and are undergoing the two years' preliminary probation, before they can be admitted to take the vows [3].

Of these eight classes it is to be noted that four only, the first, second, third, and fifth, are permanent grades, which being once attained, no further advancement is, as a matter of rule, contemplated, whereas the other four are of their very nature probationary and transition classes, through which individuals pass into the former.

This hierarchical array, however, formidable as it is [4], does not

[7] Exam. Gener. c. vi. § 1, 2. Constit. Pars v. c. iv. § 1, 2.
[8] Exam. Gener. c. i. § 9, c. vi. § 8.
[9] Exam. Gener. c. vi. § 1. 3. 6, Constit. Pars v. c. iv. § 3. Decl. c; Reg. Comm. 14.
[1] Exam. Gener. c. i. § 9, c. vi. § 8.
[2] Exam. Gener. c. i. § 10; c. vii. § 1. Constit. P. iv. c. iii. § 3; P. v. c. iv. § 3, 4.
[3] Exam. Gener. c. i. § 12.
[4] The following table, collected from various sources of information, will throw light upon the progressive increase of the order, both in ancient and in modern times. We take the numbers as they stood in **1556**, at the death of Loyola; **1565**, at the death of Laynez; **1580**, at the death of Mercurian; **1615**, at the death of

by any means comprehend the whole body of what may be justly called the Jesuit militia; what we have now enumerated, are but the skeletons, as it were, of the Jesuit regiments, distributed over the different countries of the world. There are countless individuals, and whole bodies of men, who are, without taking the vows, without complying with the rules of the order, perhaps even without knowing it, in a state of more or less subserviency to the interests and purposes of the society. We will endeavour to sum up the means which the Jesuits put in operation for this purpose under a few principal heads.

1. The Jesuits sometimes disguise their existence by assuming the names of other congregations. They did so at the very commencement of their order, when they played hide-and-seek in Spain under the name of Theatines; and again in 1561, when the French parliament prohibited their existence in France as a branch of the order, but permitted them to reside there under episcopal control, a condition of which the reverend fathers, as M. Crétineau-Joly[5] informs us, "made no account." They put up

Aquaviva; 1626, under Vitelleschi; 1749, under Retz; and after their re-establishment in 1838, 1841, and 1844.

Year.	*Provinces.*	*No. of Establishments.*	*No. of Members.*
1556	12	100	1000
1565	18	130	3500
1580	21	110	5000
1615	33	550	13,000
1626	39	803	15,500
1749	..	1603	22,500
1838	14	173	3067
1841	14	211	3565
1844	14	233	4133

Hence it appears that their progress since their restoration in 1814 has, in spite of the violent prejudice existing against them in every country of Europe, been on the whole rather more rapid than it was at their commencement. Within twenty-five years of the foundation of the order they had 3500 members in 130 establishments; within the same period since their restoration they have between 3000 and 3500 members, and about 200 establishments. They have certainly no reason to feel discouraged.

[5] We cannot say much in praise of the work of M. Crétineau-Joly, from which the above account is derived. We should have taken him for a *Jésuite de robe courte*, did not charity forbid it after his positive assertion to the contrary. "The Jesuits," he says in his introductory chapter, "have never counted me among their pupils; they have never seen me among their neophytes. I have been neither their friend, nor their admirer, nor their opponent. I owe them no gratitude; my mind is wholly unprejudiced in regard to their order. I am neither theirs, nor with them, nor for them, nor against them. They are to me what Vitellius, Otho and Galba, were to Tacitus. I have received neither injury nor benefit at their hands. As an historian I confine myself to history; I am bent upon truth alone; I only endeavour to induce logical consequences from undisputed and indisputable facts, without forming any opinion except after the most conscientious examination." We are sadly afraid that M. Crétineau-Joly has every way failed to come up to this high-sounding *programme* of his own performance. Verily he is no Tacitus, either in historical truth or in style. As regards the former, the reader will be astonished to

over the door of their college at Clermont the inscription, "*Collegium societatis* NOMINIS *Jesu*," but continued in all other respects to be what they had been before; and it is curious to see how, in their interrogatory before the rector of the university, they evaded the knotty question whether they were Jesuits or no. In later times, since their suppression by Clement XIV., they have haunted different parts of Europe under the names of *Pères de la Foi*, *Victimes de l'Amour de Dieu*, *Picpus*, Paccanarists, Missionaries, &c., and if the statements of some of their French opponents may be relied on, they have assumed the disguise of Lazarists, Dominicans, and even Benedictines. This we are scarcely disposed to believe on the bare assertion of partisans like M. Michelet[6] and M. Génin[7]; but it is far from improbable

hear that the five volumes are nothing more than one continued encomium and apology of the order. M. Crétineau-Joly had free access, he says, to the archives of the *Gesu* at Rome. No doubt the Jesuits knew whom they trusted with their secrets. In point of style and arrangement it has scarcely ever fallen to our lot to wade through a heavier book. It is a voluminous and crowded mass of ill-assorted and ill-digested materials; and from the violent partizanship of the author little reliance can be placed upon his statements, except when they make against his clients.

[6] M. Michelet makes a statement to that effect, as far as the Lazarists and Benedictines are concerned, in his book on the Jesuits, (No. 7,) and he repeats it in his later work, *du Prêtre, de la Femme, et de la Famille*. Of this it will not be necessary for us to speak on the present occasion, as it touches upon our subject only incidentally. With regard to his book on the Jesuits, published in conjunction with M. Quinet, it consists of the two courses of lectures, or rather sketches of them, which were delivered by the two professors and friends at the *Collège de France* in the early part of the summer of 1843, and which, thanks to the outcry raised by the Jesuits themselves, have become so notorious since. M. Michelet's lectures are in substance a half political, half philosophical tirade against the order, written in an exceedingly animated, clever, aphoristic style. There are many brilliant flashes of thought; but the spirit of the whole savours too much of that modern French school, which assumes the principles of the revolution as the basis of the national life.

The lectures of M. Quinet are greatly superior, both in matter and manner; they contain more real information on the subject of which they treat, and their tone is in keeping with the religious character of the question at issue. He briefly reviews the history of the Jesuits, their constitutions and their missions, with a view to show that their system is a gross corruption of the Gospel; at the same time he too enters most warmly into the demi-political controversy of the day. We incline to think that both the professors might easily have chosen topics far more appropriate to the capacities and the literary wants of the youths who compose their legitimate audience.

[7] Of Mr. Génin's book we cannot speak otherwise than in terms of strong reprobation, at least as far as its tone and spirit are concerned. It is in some respects an interesting volume, as it contains a brief history of the literary warfare which has been carried on for the last five years in France between the ultramontanes and the ultra-liberals. Mr. Génin is an able dialectician; though in many parts he has weakened his argument by hypercritical remarks on the style of his opponents. But what we chiefly find fault with, is his scoffing spirit, and his occasional scurrility on subjects which ought never to be spoken of otherwise than with reverence. There is an affectation of jealousy for true religion, but every now and then the cloven foot too evidently appears, to leave any doubt as to the real sentiments of the author.

that they are in communication with the different congregations recently revived in France, and that they exercise very considerable influence over them, especially as there is a provision in the *Directorium*, which contemplates the infusion of Jesuitism into other orders[8].

2. The Jesuits form various religious congregations and other associations, the members of which are under an obligation of obedience to the superiors, who themselves are Jesuits. The establishment of such auxiliaries is contemplated by the rules of the order[9], and as a matter of history it is well known that some of the most popular of these associations owe their existence to the Jesuits. The most ancient of them, the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin of the Annunciation, was, and to all appearance still is, established in all the colleges and seminaries of the order, under the provisions of the *Ratio Studiorum*[1]. Another association of

Even such a pun as that which he perpetrates on the text, "*Qui potest capere, capiat*" (p. 203), would hardly come from the pen of an ordinarily religious person; but the flippant witticism in which he indulges on the subject of our blessed Lord's address to St. Peter (p. 175, note) is positively and shockingly profane. Neither have we any very high opinion of the sincerity of M. Génin's zeal for moral purity; we cannot understand how any man could make up his mind to the republication, in a book intended for extensive popular circulation, of the frightful obscenities which M. Génin has dragged from their hiding-places in the manuals of Jesuit *Theologia Moralis*. To obtrude such things upon the public eye is both indecent and mischievous; it infinitely aggravates the evil which it pretends to cure.

[8] The ninth chapter of the *Directorium* turns upon the use of the *Exercitia* for persons who have already irrevocably chosen a state of life, such as married persons, or persons bound by monastic vows. In reference to the latter the *Directorium* decides, that such persons may not only themselves be made to go through the exercises, but they may be initiated into the method of using them, especially if they be superiors of religious houses, or otherwise in a position in which they would be likely to introduce them into more general use. "And this," says the *Directorium*, "will be better than if we did it ourselves, lest we should incur the odious appearance of wanting to reform other orders."

[9] The *Ordinationes Generalium* (c. xxi.) contain a letter addressed to the provincials by General Aquaviva, laying down rules for the establishment of sodalities of the blessed Virgin, in the colleges, houses, and seminaries of the order, in connexion with the original Roman congregation of "the Blessed Virgin of the Annunciation," established by authority of Pope Gregory XIII; and among the *Instructions for missions*, which were drawn up by the same Aquaviva, and which, be it remembered, apply also to protestant or "heretic" countries, the following direction occurs: "They shall take care to institute and propagate, wherever there is an opportunity, some fraternity of the most blessed sacrament, or of the Name of God, or of the Rosary, or of the Christian doctrine." *Instr.* XII. *pro Mission*, § 14. Are the *frères de la doctrine Chrétienne*, into whose hands the education of the lower classes of the French people is rapidly passing, connected with the order of Jesuits? We have no positive proof that they are so, but there are strong grounds for suspecting it.

[1] See *Constitutions*, *Paris*, 1843. *App. Note D*, where the passages from the *Ratio Studiorum* are quoted. It appears that the first idea originated with the Jesuit John Léon, who about the year 1560 established "*une petite Confrérie de la Sainte Vierge*," among the junior classes. The notion soon spread; in 1569, there were congregations of this kind established at Rome, at Naples, at Genoa, and Perugia; and in

the same kind, under the name of "The Pious Sodality of the most Blessed Heart of Jesus," was established towards the end of the 17th century, likewise under the auspices of the Jesuits, by the joint efforts of the fanatic Mary Alacoque, and the Jesuit Claude La Colombière, chaplain to the Duchess of York, afterwards queen of James II. Amidst the convulsions which marked the close of the last century, it seems to have languished for a time, but new life was infused into it in the year 1803 by a brief of Pius VII., and it is now in full operation both in this country and in other parts of the world, as an auxiliary of the Jesuits [2].

1584 Pope Gregory XIII. authorized the establishment of such congregations, in connexion with the central congregation of the church of the Roman College, all over the world, by the Bull "*Omnipotentis Dei Salvatoris.*" "Under the hand of the Jesuits," continues M. Crétineau-Joly, "whose general was the Director in chief of the congregations, they grew mightily, like the grain of mustard seed. They passed beyond the precincts of the college with the young men who entered upon life, and who desired to remain in communion of prayer and remembrance with their masters and their fellow-pupils. . . . They had statutes, rules, prayers and duties in common. There was one great fraternity which reached from Paris to Goa, and from Rome to the obscurest little town. The congregations of Avignon, Antwerp, Prague, and Fribourg were the most celebrated. Some of them consisted of ecclesiastics, military men, magistrates, nobles, citizens, merchants, artizans, and servants, all devoting themselves to good works; all according to their ability assisting the poor, visiting the sick, comforting the prisoners, instructing the children, and endowing poor girls. Tasso and Lambertini, St. Francis de Sales and Fénélon, Alphonso de Liguori and Bossuet, Ferdinand of Austria and Maximilian of Bavaria, the Princes of Conti and of Turenne, piety and genius, the majesty of the throne and military glory, associated together in these assemblies, *over which a Jesuit, under the title of Director, presided.* . . . This congregation, which embraced the whole world, *doubled the moral power of the society of Jesus;* patronized by the Popes, countenanced by kings, it went onward to accomplish its object, without taking notice of the attacks directed against its religious practices and its humane purpose. . . . That great Pope Benedict XIV. . . . who had been the pupil of the Jesuits, knew by experience the spirit of the associations directed by them. He had belonged to them in his youth, and on the 27th September, 1748, he published the golden bull "*Gloriosæ Dominæ.*"—Crétineau-Joly, vol. i. p. 342; vol. iv. p. 221—223.

[2] We have now lying before us the "Devotion and Office of the Sacred Heart of Jesus," published in London, 1821, and containing among other documents an "Indult of his holiness Pope Pius VII., in favour of it, *for the use of the midland district;*" dated June 27, 1814; and another smaller manual of the same devotion, published at Dublin, 1826, which gives a list of the "Pious sodalities of the Sacred Heart," established in Ireland, *beginning with St. Patrick's College, Maynooth,* and ending with an &c. In the former there is a short history of the origin and progress of this devotion; with an essay on its nature and effects, in which it is stated that "our amiable Redeemer" being "banished from many places wherein his love induced him to reside, Catholics alone now possess him;" and in reply to the objection why there should be a particular feast in honour of the divine heart of Jesus, and not other feasts also "to honour every part of his sacred body," it is said: "It is of little purpose to dispute whether the feast of the sacred heart deserves to be approved. In a point of this nature, a great part of the Church, authorized by so many bishops, and the holy see, cannot mistake." We should have supposed it would have been quite sufficient to refer to the fact alleged in an earlier part of this singularly profane and superstitious composition, that our Lord himself, having personally appeared to "the holy nun, the venerable mother, Mary Margaret" (Mary Alacoque), complained to her of the ingratitude he met with among mankind, and commanded the feast of his divine

Among the various movements connected with these sodalities, the following deserves particular notice :—

"At this crisis," says M. Crétineau-Joly, speaking of the opposition made to the Jesuits and to the bull *Unigenitus*, during the minority of Louis XV., and quoting the words of Lemontey in his *Histoire de la Régence*, "the Jesuits conducted themselves like men inured to storms. They patiently pocketed the various affronts which they had to endure, and relied for an improvement of their condition upon time, upon the faults of their opponents, and upon the corrupt character of the regency, which would without fail bring their flexible doctrine into request. But while they themselves proceeded with the utmost circumspection, they secretly incited the court of Rome and the bishops who were favourable to the bull, to various resolutions. But what admirably characterizes the indefatigable policy of these regulars, is their attempting at that moment an enterprise so daring and so deep, that they had not ventured upon it in the days of their highest prosperity. *They conceived the plan of establishing in the garrison towns congregations of soldiers, and the Jesuits would have had the army on their side, if the government had not quickly put a stop to this religious decoy, and rescued military discipline from a corruption so ingeniously devised.*

"The accusation," sneeringly continues the unwary advocate of the Jesuits, M. Crétineau-Joly, "of *congregationizing* the army was a much greater novelty than the fact itself. *The Jesuits had been living under the tent of the soldier* in France, from Henry II. to Louis XIV., and in Europe from 1584 to 1715 . . . they had formed a kind of military literature[3] . . . they had instituted congregations in the levels of Poland, in the mountains of Bohemia, in the plains of Flanders, and in

heart to be instituted, naming the very day on which it was to be celebrated. Pages might be filled with extracts illustrative of the grossness and carnality of this superstition ; we shall content ourselves with one more, detailing the proceedings at the monthly meeting of the association, for the choice of the devotional practices (of which the volume contains a great many), to be followed by each member during the ensuing month. "Let there be as many billets folded up as there are persons who compose this association : on the inside of each of these must be wrote (*sic !*) some particular practice. The whole being mixed together, each draws one billet for himself, and engages himself to offer up, on the Fridays of the following month to the sacred heart, that practice which has fallen to his lot." Piety by lottery! how characteristic of that state of the heart which it is the object of the rule of St. Ignatius Loyola to produce! An account of this sodality will be found in an article on the revival of Jesuitism, in No. xlix. of the British Critic.

[3] The following list of titles is given in a note: "The Fencing-Master, the Christian Soldier, the Mirror of Soldiers, the Good Soldier, Advice to Soldiers, the Manual of the Christian Soldier, the Christian Warrior, the Glorious Soldier, Instructions for a Christian Soldier." All these were composed by Jesuits. Is there such a literature still extant? And has it ever found its way into the British army? Let the authorities at the Horse-guards look well to this. If we remember right, temperance associations have recently been put down by order of the Commander-in-chief; and in France the Sodality of St. Vincent de Paul has been prohibited in the army within the last two years.

the military towns and fortresses of France . . . In the session of the council of war of July 19th, 1716, associations of soldiers presided over by Jesuits were prohibited." *Crétineau-Joly*, vol. iv. pp. 482—484.

The same system of enlisting large masses of the people under the Jesuit banner by means of religious congregations is pursued with renewed vigour in the present day; not only are the old sodalities revived, but new ones are established. In the year 1837 was instituted at Paris, in the church of *Notre Dame des Victoires*, under the patronage of M. de Quélen, Archbishop of Paris, the *archi-confrérie du très-saint et immaculé cœur de Marie;* and it has since been extended to almost every part of the world.

"There are few dioceses in France which do not reckon, among the faithful, associates of the sacred heart of Mary. This devotion is spreading in foreign lands, it has its associates in almost every country of Europe. Portugal, Naples, and Sweden, alone are not to be found on the register. The new world begins to go forth to the conquest of sinners, under the banner of the holy and immaculate heart of Mary. . . . In all classes of society, both at Paris and at a distance from the capital, the sick are healed, unbelievers brought back to the faith of our fathers, women of the world become chaste, military men blush not to avow that they owe their cure to Mary; youths and philosophers confess their crimes and their errors, and march unabashed under the banner of the Virgin; such are the immense fruits which have been obtained by the *archi-confrérie* of the most holy and immaculate heart of Mary.

"It appeals also to the charity of its members in favour of *the conversion of England;* generous appeal for that ancient cradle of religion, that land of saints! And to the ardent prayers of the associates is already, perhaps, to be attributed the propagation of the faith in the three kingdoms, and especially in London, where the number of Catholics so sensibly increases[4]."

[4] *Le Culte de la sainte Vierge dans toute la Catholicité: par* A. Égron. Paris. 1842, pp. 223—226. A note adds: "Nothing gives a higher idea of the power of prayer, than these recommendations addressed by the ministers of the altar to all around them on behalf of a sick person, a person in a state bordering on despair, &c. &c.; it is then that these Christians, prostrate, devout, full of a lively faith, do as it were violence to God, and *extort from him through the mediation of his Mother, to whom He can refuse nothing, unlooked for healings of body and soul.*" These are the prayers of which a clergyman of the English branch of the true Catholic Church has ventured thus to write: "The first pang came to me years ago, when I had no other fear, but heard that he was prayed for by name in so many churches and religious houses on the continent. The fear was suggested to me, 'if they pray so earnestly for this object, that he may be won to be an instrument of God's glory among them, while among us there is so much indifference, and in part dislike, *may it not be that their prayers may be heard, that God will give them whom they pray for,* we forfeit whom we desire not to retain?' And now must they not think, that

For a further account of this association, and of the superstition of the *Médaille Miraculeuse* connected with it, we refer our readers to a former number of the English Review, (No. vii. p. 147). Up to January 1842 the muster-roll of the sodality amounted to 250,000 members.

Another auxiliary of the Jesuits, of a yet more formidable character, is the "Catholic Association," which has been established both in France and in this country, and which has for its object the restoration of papal ascendancy to its pristine vigour. The book of M. Génin contains some extracts from the *programme* privately circulated among its members, with a recommendation to "use the greatest discretion; no member being permitted, of his own motion and authority, to communicate or to make known to any one, directly or indirectly, the existence, the means, or the rules of the association." The following passage throws light on its spirit and on the objects it has in view:

"The novice admitted into the association shall swear to combat even unto death the enemies of humanity. Every day and every hour is to be devoted to the development of Christian civilization. He has sworn eternal hatred to the genius of evil, and he has promised *absolute and unreserved submission to our holy father the pope, and to the orders of the hierarchical superiors of the association.* The director, in admitting him, has exclaimed, 'We have one soldier more!'" *Les Jésuites et l'Université, par F. Génin*, pp. 266, 267.

Here again we have the characteristic features of Jesuitism. War, war to the knife, against all that is not popery; and blind, absolute submission to the superiors, and through them, to the Pope. Who can doubt that the Catholic Association is either the right hand, or the twin sister of the society of Jesuits? That association is established within these realms, and we know therefore (have we not already felt it?) what we have to expect. Our "heresy," our "Anglicanism," what is it, in the eyes of these men, but an offspring of that "genius of evil," against which they have sworn to fight, "even unto death?"

Besides these, which are of a more general character, there are a variety of associations, formed since the recrudescence of Jesuitism in France, which have for their object to lay hold of particular classes of the population. Of this kind are the *Œuvre de la Sainte Enfance*, for children; the *Association des jeunes économes*, for maid-servants; the *Association de secours mutuels sous l'invocation*

their prayers, which they have offered so long,—at times I think night and day, or at the Holy Eucharist, *have been heard?*" *Dr. Pusey's "Letter to a Friend," on Mr. Newman's Apostasy. Church Chronicle*, p. 451.

de Notre Dame du Rosaire, a kind of benefit society for the working classes; the *Œuvre des Apprentis*, for apprentices; and, last, not least, the *Œuvre de St. François Xavier*, for mechanics and workmen. In all these associations the promotion of the temporal interests of the members, as well as secular instruction, and even amusement, are blended with those religious objects and practices, by means of which the members of these associations are made subservient to the purposes of the Jesuits.

3. The Jesuits convert the schools and colleges over which they have influence or control, into nurseries for recruiting their order by the ablest and fittest subjects, and into channels for the extensive diffusion of their principles. To get the education of all the classes of society into their hands was from the very first one of the principal objects of their ambition, as the surest means of attaining that universal monarchy of mind to which Loyola had, on behalf of the papacy, the daring to aspire. The Constitutions bear witness how deeply this thought was interwoven with the whole of his system.

"Forasmuch," he says in the introduction to that part of the Constitutions, "as good and learned men are comparatively but few, and most of these of an age to look for rest from their labours, we conceive it to be extremely difficult to increase our society by the accession of such men, seeing how great labours and self-denials its Institute imposes. Wherefore all we who desired its preservation and increase, for the greater praise and the service of our Lord God, thought fit to pursue a different course, viz., to admit youths of promising character and abilities, likely to become good and learned men, fit to cultivate the vineyard of Christ our Lord; also to admit colleges upon the terms set forth in the apostolic letters, both in universities and elsewhere; and in the former case equally so, whether the universities be placed under our charge or no[5]."—*Constit. Pars* iv. *Procem. Decl.* A.

These scholastic establishments were, however, not to be mere nurseries of the order; the founder looked far beyond that; though he puts forth his ideas cautiously and by degrees, as if he was afraid of the boldness of his own conceptions.

"If there should not be found in the colleges of the society a sufficient number of scholars dedicated to the service of God in it, by promise or intention, it will not be repugnant with our institute to admit, by licence from the general, and for such time as he shall appoint, *other poor scholars* who have no such intention, provided they labour under none of the impediments" [to admission into the order] "specified in the

[5] We recommend this clause to the particular notice of Sir Robert Peel. It will enable him to arrange the plan of his new Irish Universities with Drs. Crolly, Murray, and Mc Hale, on principles which they will hardly be able to repudiate.

first part, and from their disposition afford a reasonable hope that they will be good workmen in the vineyard of Christ our Lord, on account of their talents, their proficiency in letters, their good character, suitable age, or any other gifts of God that might appear to render them suitable for God's service, which is all that is required both of those that belong to the society, and of those without its pale. Such scholars, however, must be conformable to the scholars of the society in their attendance upon the confessional, in their studies, and their manner of living; although they be differently dressed, and live in a distinct part of the college, so that those who follow the institute of the society may still remain separate, and not mix with others that are without; at the same time they may have intercourse with them so far as the superior may judge fit for greater edification, and the more effectual service of our Lord God.

"But even though the number of our own pupils should be sufficient, yet it will not be repugnant to our institute to admit scholars who have no intention to enter our society, provided *the terms agreed upon with the founders* require it (for it will be considered conducive to the end which the society has in view, to admit colleges on such terms), or else upon other uncommon and important accounts. Such, however, must live separate, and not converse, without the superior's leave, with any persons of the society, except those specially pointed out to them for that purpose.

"The expense of poor scholars not belonging to the society will be defrayed by the general, or by his deputy. And sometimes for just causes, there appears to be no reason why *the sons of wealthy and noble persons* should not be admitted, provided they live at their own charges." —*Const. Pars* iv. c. iii. *Decl.* B.

Thus from a seminary of young Jesuits, Loyola rises insensibly to a mixed college, a foundation college, and a college for commoners. But even that falls very far short of his desire to benefit the world by having it under the influence of his system.

"The same motive of charity which leads us to admit colleges, and to maintain in them public schools, for the edification in doctrine and life, not only of our own scholars, but still more of those that are without, may be further extended to undertaking the charge of universities, with a view to still more extensive usefulness, as regards both the sciences taught, and the men who congregate in them, as well as the degrees to which they are promoted; *so that they may in other places also teach with authority what they have duly learned in them to the glory of God.*"—*Constit. Pars* iv. c. xi. § 1.

Perhaps our readers think that these schools will be very unattractive considering the severe discipline of the Jesuits, their confessions, their restrictions upon the common freedom of intercourse. If so, they are much mistaken. The Jesuit's policy is not so short-sighted. His is an iron grasp after you are caught,

but, while he is trying to catch you, velvet is his touch. The schools being conducted by a religious order, and for religious ends, no doubt they will be begun with prayer? Undoubtedly so, as a rule:—

"Let it be the peculiar study of the teachers to excite the scholars both in their lessons, as occasion may occur, and at other times, to the obedience and love of God, and to the practice of the virtues by which they may please him, so that they may refer all their studies to this one end. And, in order that they may be put in mind of this, let some short prayer composed for the purpose be said at the beginning of the lesson, to which both the teacher and the scholars are to listen attentively with heads uncovered."—*Constit. Pars* iv. c. xvi. § 4.

So far so good, but there is no rule without exception:—

"The prayer is either to be said in such manner as that it may lead to an increase of devotion and edification, *or else it is not to be said at all;* in which case let the teacher, uncovering his own head, make the sign of the cross, and so proceed."—*Constit. Pars* iv. § 4, *Decl.* c.

But what in the name of wonder should prevent a school prayer from being said with edification, especially when the teacher is a Jesuit? Perhaps the chapter which treats of the matriculation of the pupils, may help us out of the difficulty. In the first instance, it seems, there is free admission for all to the class or lecture rooms; afterwards comes an attempt to introduce order:—

"When any continue to attend the schools diligently for more than a week, they are to be invited to give their names for entry in the matriculation book; at the same time, such constitutions as they have respectively to observe are to be read to them, and a promise, not on oath, to obey and to observe the same, is to be required of them. *If any refuse to make such promise, or to give their names for matriculation, they are not on that account to be excluded from the schools,* provided they conduct themselves peaceably and inoffensively; and this may be intimated to them, yet with this addition, that more attention is usually paid to those pupils whose names are on the book of the university."—*Constit. Pars* iv. c. xvii. *Decl.* D.

We venture to say that the wildest educational liberalism of Lord Brougham and Mr. Wyse never contemplated going nearly as far that. We should like to see some poor wight compose himself on the benches of Gower-street College, week after week, without paying a fee (the Jesuits never took any), without taking off his hat, compelling the Rev. Anybody to cross himself, because there is no saying prayers reverently in the presence of such a fellow, and withal, when asked his name by the beadle, refuse

to give it. But there was no new police in the days of Loyola, except that which he himself set on foot for the benefit of Christendom.

The reader may laugh; but the plan answered. All the Jesuits had to do, was to take care (which they soon learned to do) not to accept any colleges without sufficient endowments[6], nor to take in hand more schools than they could find teachers for. With a view to supply these, the second general congregation decreed that a seminary for the education of professors and other teachers should be established in every province[7]. As the society increased in numbers, this difficulty was overcome, a large portion of the members being, agreeably to the vows of the professed members and spiritual coadjutors[8], which contain a special clause to this effect, employed in the business of instructing youth. Such was their success, that in the year 1710 they had under their management 24 universities[9], 612 colleges, 157 seminaries, and 59 novitiates, besides 340 residences, 200 missions, and 24 professed houses.

Such are the means by which the Jesuits put themselves in possession of the principal channels of influence over the minds of men; they borrow, as occasion may serve, the names of other orders, and lend to them their spirit; they gather the unconscious masses around them in congregations and sodalities, in which they take them captive by the most debasing superstitions; they erect schools and colleges, where they may pick the choicest spirits to be *cadaverized* for their own use, and turn the rest loose upon the world to rule and to fashion it in their sense and upon their principles.

Yet even this is not all. There is yet remaining behind the most powerful of all the engines which they have brought to bear upon mankind, not the less powerful, because it acts individually and imperceptibly, the confessional. The direction which Loyola has given to this influence in the hands of his order, is not the least remarkable of the many evidences of deep design and far-sighted calculation, with which his whole system abounds. By a special provision, the charge of confessing nunneries is declined in the statutes[1]; partly no doubt to avoid the scandals to which that

[6] Congr. Gen. ii. Decr. 11; iii. Decr. 30.

[7] Congr. Gen. ii. Decr. 13.

[8] The following is the clause in the vows, which refers to this subject, "*Ego N. promitto . . . perpetuam paupertatem, castitatem, et obedientiam; et, secundum eam, peculiarem curam circa puerorum eruditionem.*" *Constit. Pars* v. c. iii. § iv.

[9] The privilege of granting academical degrees was first conferred upon the society by Julius III., in the bull *Sacræ Religionis*, and afterwards extended by the bull *Exponi Nobis* of Pius IV.

[1] Constit. Pars vi. c. iii. § 5. Yet, as usual, there is an exception, for *special* causes. The Jesuits never forbid themselves any thing, without re-permitting it, in case it should be thought expedient for the interests of the order, "*ad majorem Dei gloriam.*"

charge not unfrequently gave rise, but chiefly because the Jesuits would have no time to bestow upon an employment so utterly foreign to the purposes of their Institute. What interest could they possibly take in the contemplative piety of a number of cloistered beings, shut out from all intercourse with the world? If they were to trouble themselves at all with undertaking the spiritual charge of women, it would be those rather who lived in the world, whose influence might be turned to account; but even they were to be despatched as briefly and as dryly as possible[2]. What Loyola sought to attain by means of the confessional, was to get the ear of kings and princes, and of other men placed in high stations, and possessed of extensive power. It was the official rather than the personal conscience that he desired to bring under guidance and control. With that profound penetration with which he scanned the secret springs of human actions, he perceived that the reins of the world's government would be far more securely and efficiently under the command of his order by this indirect rule over the minds of those in whose hands the power was, than if he could have placed members of the society on every throne and in every episcopal chair[3]. A coldness of calculation, and a firmness of purpose, which none of the actual holders of power will ever be able to attain in his own person, was made to preside over its exercise by the influence of

[2] There is an almost ludicrous anxiety apparent in the instructions to confessors, lest they should get entangled with the spiritual difficulties, and the contemplative propensities of the fair sex, from the toils of which even a Bossuet and a Fénélon found it not always easy to escape. No confessor is to hear the confessions of women, until he has had two years' practice in confessing men. The penitents are to confine themselves strictly to confession, and not to be allowed to talk on spiritual subjects; if they require special consolation or counsel, it is to be administered not in the confessional, but standing or sitting in the open area of the Church; cravings after devotional exercises and instructions are to be satisfied by handing them some book treating of spiritual matters; the same woman is not to be allowed to come to confession twice in the same day; the office of spiritual director is not to be undertaken at all, except by special permission of the provincial, who will only grant it upon these three conditions: that the woman shall be a woman of rank and consequence, that she shall have rendered the society important services, and that it shall be agreeable to her husband or her other relatives. *Instructio* iii. *pro Confessariis*, § 1, 3, 6, 9.

[3] No doubt this consideration had its share in the rule which forbids the acceptance of any benefice or ecclesiastical dignity by the members of the order, except by special dispensation from the general, and that not to be granted otherwise than upon the peremptory demand of the Pope himself.—*Constit. Pars* ix. c. iii. § 13; *Pars* x. § 6; compare also, as to simple ecclesiastical benefices, *Congr. Gen.* i. *Tit.* vi. *Decr.* 60.—In practice, however, this rule has by degrees become considerably relaxed; especially in the "missions" of the society; that is, in all those countries where the ancient papal hierarchy has been swept away, and which have to be reconquered by the Jesuit soldiery. Hence it is, that the Romish clergy in those countries are generally of a far more Jesuitical and ultra-montane spirit, as is the case at this moment in France and in Great Britain, where probably most of the inferior clergy, and not a few of those invested with the episcopal character, are members or dependents of the Jesuit community.

a confessor and spiritual director, who was himself a man without a will of his own, the mechanical exponent of the will of his order, and, by the power of that order, as it was in its palmy days, protected from dependence upon even princely favour or displeasure.

It is the fashion with the apologists of the Jesuits, to deny that such ambitious projects ever entered the mind of Loyola. They would have us believe that all he aimed at, was to found an order of self-denying men, thoroughly devoted to the service of their Church, and bound together for that service by the link of absolute obedience; and that the immense political influence which the order no doubt exercised at one time, was the unforeseen effect of its transcendent merits, rather than the result of premeditation and the fruit of intrigue. The answer to this is obvious; the constitutions, which were drawn up by the hand of Loyola himself, clearly contemplate the political importance of the order, and make provision for it.

"Because good is the more divine, the more universally it is diffused, a preference is to be given to those men and to those places, from which, if they be benefited, the same good will reach many others which follow their authority, or are governed by them. Thus spiritual help given to great and public men, (whether they be men of the world, as princes, lords, magistrates, or ministers of justice, or else ecclesiastics, as the prelates,) and to other men eminent for their learning or their influence, is to be accounted of greater importance for this reason, that the good done is more universally diffused." *Const. Pars* vii. c. ii. *Decl.* D.

And again, in the end of the constitutions, where the means of preserving and promoting the well-being of the society are under consideration:

"With the same view, care ought to be taken to preserve the love and good-will of all towards the society, even of those that are without; but especially of those whose good-will or ill-will towards us has great weight in opening to us the door of God's service and of usefulness to the souls of men, or shutting it against us."

And in the declaration appended to this passage:

"Above all, the good-will of the apostolic see is to be preserved, to whose service the society is to be more especially devoted; and after that the good-will of secular princes, of magnates, and men in high authority." *Constit. Pars* x. § 11. *Decl.* B.

It is self-evident that the subsequent position of the order, when behind every Roman Catholic throne in Europe there stood a Jesuit confessor, and a Jesuit emissary ascended the backstairs of every Protestant palace, where by any possibility access

could be obtained, was nothing but the successful realization of the bold thought which Loyola had conceived, and which his first successors at all events were well qualified to carry into effect. Never perhaps was an abler masterpiece of diplomacy drawn up than the instruction to the confessors of princes by General Aquaviva [4]. High as the confessor is placed, he is kept tightly grasped within the discipline of the order; he is to remain entirely isolated from the court and the men in power; his business is with the prince and with the prince alone. To him he is to speak without reserve; not only on those points which the prince may have revealed to him in confession, but on any point involving the welfare of his kingdom and the interests of religion, which may otherwise fall under his observation. He is never to lend himself to the furtherance of any measure, even though recommended by himself. To him it belongs to advise *ad majorem Dei gloriam;* the execution is the prince's own affair. The Jesuit takes the responsibility in the closet, the prince is left to take it before the world. So was James II. of England, so was Charles X. of France undone!

Hitherto we have traced out the character of the society of Jesuits, as it may be gathered from its origin and its constitutions; we have ascertained that the order is in fact a gigantic engine for the maintenance and consolidation of popery in the world; we have seen by what means it recruits itself from the general body of the Romish Church, by what process it reduces its members to a condition of blind instrumentality, and in how subtle a manner it contrives to gain influence in every class of society, and in every country of the world, acting like a leaven of spiritual corruption upon the mass of mankind. In order to complete the portraiture of the society, it remains for us to examine the system of morality, the rule of right and wrong, which the society has adopted, and by which it regulates the actions and directs the consciences of those over whom it has obtained control or ascendancy. This is a subject which has been frequently discussed; from the publication of the famous *Lettres Provinciales*, down to the recent exposures contained in the works of Messrs. Michelet, Quinet, Génin, and others, the relaxed morality of the Jesuits has been the constant theme of the enemies of the order; and as constantly have the Jesuits themselves pleaded "not guilty" to the impeachment which charged them, not unjustly as the sequel will show, with a total subversion not only of the lofty morality of the Gospel, but even of the commonest principles of right and wrong, recognized

[4] Ordin. Gener. c. xi. De Confessariis Principum.

among mankind by virtue of the *lex non scripta* of the natural conscience.

Before going into the particulars of the evidence by which that impeachment is supported, and which has gained less credence in the world than it deserves, on account of the incredible wickedness of the entire system of Jesuit morality, it will be useful to point out the foundation on which that system rests, and the causes from which its corrupt character flows by a kind of moral necessity. The ultimate basis of the Jesuit doctrine *de officiis* is, strange to say, one in which all Christian men cannot but agree; it is that which meets us at the very threshold of the *Exercitia*, viz. that all human actions are to be subservient to one great and universal purpose, which is the glory of God; "*ad majorem Dei gloriam*," is the warrant by which all the doctrines as well as the proceedings of the society are supported. It is in the practical application of this first and unimpeachable principle that the iniquity with which the Jesuits stand charged, is introduced; and that by means of two axioms, which being once granted, all the rest follows as a matter of course. These axioms are, first, that the way to promote the glory of God, is to extend and to strengthen the supremacy, temporal and spiritual, of the Roman See throughout the world; the Romish communion in the most uncompromising form into which ultra-montanism would mould it, being, in the language of the order, synonymous with the kingdom of Christ; secondly, that the most efficient way to propagate and consolidate this papal ascendancy, is to increase the power and advance the interests of the Jesuit society. Of the rules laid down by God himself as to the manner in which He desires to be glorified by mankind, *i. e.* of the rules of Christian morality revealed in the gospel, the Jesuit doctrine takes no cognizance. The question here is, not what is according to God's own declarations lawful, or acceptable in the sight of God, but what is, in the judgment of the superiors of the order, expedient for the advancement of the society, which is equivalent with the advancement of popery, and that again equivalent with the *major Dei gloria*. In the judgment, we say, of the superiors of the order, because they are the sole interpreters of the divine will to its members. The conscience of the individual Jesuit is discharged from every responsibility except one, and that is the absolute submission both of his judgment and of his will to the decision of the superior. This principle cannot be enunciated in terms more distinct or explicit, than those in which it is propounded in the *Exercitia* and Constitutions. In the former we read:—

"That we may be altogether accordant with, and conformable to the

Catholic Church, we are bound, *if she have defined anything to be black, which to our eyes appears white, in like manner to pronounce that it is black.* For it is without doubt to be believed, that the Spirit of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the spirit of his spouse, the orthodox Church, is one and the same Spirit by which we are governed and directed towards salvation; nor is the God who of old gave the precepts of the Decalogue, another than he who at this time instructs and rules the hierarchical Church."—*Exerc. Spirit. Reg. ut cum orthod. Eccl.* xiii.

This general principle, inculcated in the *Exercitia*, is carried out into its practical consequences in the Constitutions. In the preliminary examination for the novitiate, the candidate is asked whether he is willing to submit his judgment on all matters of opinion to the decision of the society, and on all cases of conscience to the verdict of those to whom the society may refer him for this purpose [5]. In the third part of the Constitutions, which treats of the progress of the novices to the membership of the society, the perfect obedience to be yielded to the superior as being "in Christ's stead to them," is explained as applying, not to external actions only, but, it is said,—

"They must endeavour to have inwardly a resignation and real abnegation of their own will and judgment; conforming their will and judgment entirely to the will and judgment of the superior in all things (where no sin is discerned [6]), by *taking the will and judgment of the superior for the rule of their own will and judgment*, in order that they may become the more perfectly conformable to the first and highest

[5] Exam. Gener. c. iii. § 11, 12; Decl. D.

[6] This reservation of the case of sin intervening is further defined in the passage referred to, (*Decl.* B. to *Pars* vi. c. i. § 1.) as applying to a case of *manifest* sin. In the *Summarium* the reservation is altogether omitted. But whether omitted, as superfluous, or inserted, as it is in both these extracts, it is manifestly nugatory. The very submission of will and judgment here required, being a *blind* submission, on the ground that the superior is *in the place of Christ*, and that the spirit which speaks in the superior, is *the same Spirit which spoke in Christ*, virtually renders this reservation useless for every other purpose but that of saving appearances. How far the members of the order are in a position to discern "manifest sin" in any thing taught or commanded by their superiors, will become yet more evident on considering the necessary effect upon the conscience of the rule of probability, of which more hereafter. Meanwhile it may not be uninteresting to notice a practical illustration of the working of this principle of blind submission of the will and judgment, which appears in the eighth report of the commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry. It is there deposed to by several witnesses, that the students at Maynooth College declare solemnly upon oath, that they do not believe that the pope has power to dispense with the oath of allegiance, at the same time that they all firmly believe that the pope has the dispensing power. (Compare below, notes 5 and 6, p. 66). The only account the witnesses could give of this contradiction, which one of them confessed "struck the students with astonishment," was, that as they were ordered by their superiors to take the oath, they felt satisfied that it was correct to take it. See commissioners' report, Appendix, No. 40, p. 325. No. 45, p. 365, 366. The evidence here referred to will be found also in notes w and x to Dr. Wordsworth's "Maynooth, the Crown and the Country."

rule of every good will and judgment, which is eternal goodness and wisdom."—*Constit. Pars* iii. c. i. § 23; cf. *Summ. Constit.* § 31.

Again, in the directions by which the admitted members are to regulate their conduct, the great aim upon which they are to direct all their energies and intentions is thus described:—

"That holy obedience may be at all times and in all respects perfect in us, both in execution and *in will and intellect*, performing with great alacrity and spiritual joy and perseverance whatever may be enjoined upon us; *persuading ourselves that all is just, and denying with a kind of blind obedience every contrary opinion or judgment of ours;* and that in all things which are ordered by the superior, wherein it cannot be positively shown, as has been said before, that some kind of sin intervenes[6]."—*Constit. Pars* vi. c. i. § 1. cf. *Summa Const.* § 35.

The way being thus paved for the introduction of any system of morality which might be propounded in the name of the order, the question arises whether (always assuming in charity that men congregating together under the name of religion would not be villains for the mere abstract love of villany) there is any thing, in the position of the order and in its objects, to induce so signal a departure from the principles of pure morality as can be clearly established from the society's own documents[7]. In answer to this question we must consider separately each of the three classes of men with whom the order has to deal, distinguishing them according to the view which the Jesuit takes, and necessarily must take, of mankind, viz., as the faithful, the unconverted, and the heretics.

With regard to the faithful, the great object of the order is to obtain an extensive influence over them; popularity in the "Catholic" world, but more especially princely favour in the courts of "Catholic" princes, is an essential condition of its success. But that popularity and that favour are not to be obtained by austerity; compromise, and that to a very great

[6] See note 6 in the preceding page.

[7] An abstract of the evidence respecting the morality of the Jesuits, collected out of the writings of 147 Jesuit authors, was drawn up by order of the parliament of Paris at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits from that country, and published in the year 1762 under the title "*Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses en tout genre, que les soi-disant Jésuites ont, dans tous les temps et persévéramment, soutenues, enseignées et publiées dans leurs livres, avec l'approbation de leurs supérieurs et généraux.*" A selection from the extracts contained in this work, which fills a large quarto volume, was published in 1839 by Messrs. Rivington under the title "The Principles of the Jesuits developed in a collection of extracts from their own authors." From this volume, which contains the materials in a carefully digested form, we have again selected the passages which will be found in the following notes; and to its pages the quotation "Extr. p. —." which we have added to the citation of the Jesuit authors themselves, refers.

extent, is generally required to gain and to keep it. Considering the state of public morals, and especially of those prevalent in kings' courts, during the first two centuries after the foundation of the order, and the necessity in which the order found itself, with a view to the attainment of its purpose, to become, in a far different sense from that in which St. Paul uses the expression, "all things to all men;" considering, moreover, that the father confessors whom the order sent forth on its ambitious missions, were not at such a distance from the sins they witnessed as to be enabled to pass them over in tacit connivance, but that they were brought, and for their own ends it was desirable they should be brought, face to face, in the confessional, with each particular sin, and every individual act of sin, we cannot at all feel surprised that the authors entrusted by the order with the task of providing rules for the guidance of its members in the ticklish business of confession, should have exhausted all the arts and shifts of casuistry in order to avoid inexpedient collisions with a moral corruption which they could not ignore, and cared not to redress. And this became the more necessary, as they had to uphold, in the consciences of those to whom they ministered in the confessional, at once the authority of the sacerdotal office, and the belief in the sufficiency of their absolution. Distinctions had to be invented which should, as much as possible, palliate their monstrous compromise with the grossest wickedness, and at the same time open the door for absolution on easy terms. Thus did the relation in which the order placed itself to the general body of the faithful, necessarily involve a relaxation of the rigid rules of gospel morality, to whatever extent the temper of the times and the circumstances of each case might require it. The consequence is, that while in theory the landmarks by which moral right and wrong are separated, have been altogether removed by the casuistry of the Jesuit moralists, in practice the moral tone of the order has varied considerably, being in better times more severe, and laxer in times of greater corruption; its rule stretching or contracting with wonderful elasticity, in exact proportion to the magnitude of the sins with which it has to deal.

Considerations of a similar nature tended to corrupt the morality of the Jesuits in their intercourse with the unconverted heathen, among whom they went forth to preach the gospel. Here also their object was not so much to win souls to Christ, or to preach the pure doctrine of the gospel, (which indeed they could not do, seeing they had totally lost sight of it themselves), as to extend the power of their own order and the dominion of the Roman pontiff. It was this which betrayed them into those

scandalous practices, indignantly reprobated even by the papacy itself, by which the labours of the Jesuits have become infamous in missionary history; the practice, on the one hand, of suppressing of the gospel whatever might prove an offence and an obstacle to their success, so far even as altogether to conceal the truth of Christ crucified from their pretended converts; and on the other hand the practice of sanctioning conformity to the grossest rites of idolatry under cover of a mental reservation, by which the worship paid was not directed to the idol, but to the image of Christ, worn secretly within their garments by the double-minded hypocrites who were thus nominally gathered into the fold of the Church.

Lastly, the morality of the Jesuits owes some, and some of the very worst, of its corruptions to the attitude which they have assumed towards all whom they brand with the name of heretics. The perpetual warfare upon which they have entered against these, and which is the very life and soul of the order,—its chief occupation as well as its most prominent feature,—being a conflict, not for the faith of the true Church, which would have constrained them to abide in the truth, but for the ascendancy of the lying Church of Rome, which threw them at once into a position of falsehood, they were compelled by the very necessity of that position to have recourse to weapons such as never could have been employed in the cause of truth and charity. The infamous maxim that as towards heretics all the rules of truth and justice cease to have any validity, that *hæreticis non est habenda fides*, led, in its practical application to the various circumstances under which the Jesuits had to encounter both evangelic truth and apostolic order, to a system of perfidious treachery beyond all past example, which has for ever identified in all the idioms of Europe the name of the order with all that is disingenuous and traitorous. Nor should we forget, in estimating the influence which this source of corruption must have had upon the general tone of Jesuit morality, that inasmuch as in many of the conflicts in which they engaged against the so-called heretics, they in fact took up arms against the true and living Church of Christ, their sin assumed the awful character of a wilful and deliberate opposition against Christ and against the Holy Ghost, and consequently brought upon them that terrible recompense of spiritual wickedness, the hardness and blindness of a reprobate mind.

Under the influence, then, of these various causes of moral deterioration, was the system of Jesuit morality developed. The first requisite, to make it practically available, was, that it should be sufficiently pliant, affording a choice of rules of every imaginable

degree of strictness and laxity. This want is admirably met by the doctrine of probable opinions[8], which the casuists of the order

[8] "The authority of one good doctor is a sufficient reason on which to ground the probability of any opinion, so that every one may safely follow it."—*Georgii de Rhodes, Disput. Theol. Schol. De Act. hum. Tom.* 1. *Disp.* 2. *Qu.* 2. *S.* 3 § 1. Extr. p. 81.

"There are two kinds of probable propositions; one being certainly probable, the other probably probable."—*Honor. Fabri, Apolog. Doctr. Mor. Soc. Jesu. Dial.* i. *n.* 23. Extr. p. 82.

"He acts prudently upon a moral opinion, who is certain that it is probable; and this, in my opinion, no one will deny. For if it is certain that it is probable, it is also certain that it is safe; i. e. that the use of it is safe, and the practice lawful."—*Ibid. n.* 53. Extr. p. 83.

"When the opinions of the doctors are divided upon any point, we may follow either opinion, even the less safe, and the less probable, provided it be truly probable."—*Gil. de Coninck, Comm. ac Disp. in univ. doctr. D. Thomæ. Disp.* 34. *Dub.* 10. *n.* 84. Extr. p. 90.

"Of two contradictory probable opinions touching the lawfulness or the unlawfulness of any human action, every one may follow in practice or in action that which he prefers, although it may appear to the party himself less probable in theory. Of two probable sides of such a question it is also lawful to follow that which is the less safe; that is, the opinion which seems less remote from every kind of sin than the other which is opposed to it."—*Paul Laymann, Theol. Mor. Tr.* 1. *c.* 5. § 2. *n.* 7. *Ass.* 1, 2. Extr. p. 96.

"Among many probable opinions, can there be one more safe than another? that is to say, can there be a greater danger of committing sin in adhering to one opinion rather than to another? I answer in the negative; for since every probable opinion renders the conscience safe in acting, the agent will not be less safe in following one opinion rather than another. Indeed, when I perceive so many different opinions maintained in matters of morality, I seem to see the brightness of divine foresight; because *through the variety of opinions the yoke of Christ is pleasantly borne.*"—*Ant. Escobar, Univ. Theol. Mor. T.* i. *L.* ii. *S.* 1. *c.* 2. *n.* 22, 23. Extr. p. 105.

"Albeit one opinion be more probable and more safe than another, and seem to you also more probable and more safe, yet it is lawful for you to abandon that opinion in practice, and to follow the less probable opinion, even though you do not abandon your speculative judgment of the matter."—*Sim. de Lessau, Prop. dict.; De præc. Decal. c.* 1. *art.* 4. Extr. p. 106.

"Whether it is lawful to follow one probable opinion at one time, and a different probable opinion at another time, upon the same subject? It is probable, for instance, that a tax has been unjustly imposed; it is also probable that it has been justly imposed. May I then to-day, in my capacity as the king's tax-gatherer, exact the said tax, and to-morrow, or even on the same day, in my capacity as a merchant, secretly defraud it? Again, it is probable, that pecuniary compensation may be made for defamation; it is also probable that it cannot be made. May I then to-day, being defamed, demand pecuniary compensation from my defamer; and to-morrow, or even on the same day, I myself defaming another, refuse to make pecuniary compensation for my neighbour's good name which I have taken away? . . . . I affirm that it is lawful to do, at pleasure, sometimes the one and sometimes the other."—*Thom. Tamburin, Expl. Decal. Lib.* i. *c.* 3. § 5. *n.* 1, 2, 5. Extr. p. 108, 109.

"There will never be any danger of corruption, if a man follow what shall appear to him more convenient, provided a probable opinion teach it not to be unlawful."—*Georgii de Rhodes, Disp. Theol. Schol. T.* i. *De Act. hum. Disp.* 2. *Qu.* 2. *S.* 3. § 3. Extr. p. 116.

"We are never more free from the violation of the law, than when we persuade ourselves that we are not bound by the law. For it is rather he who says that the law is binding, that exposes himself to the danger of sinning. For he who has thus

have brought to such perfection that any given action which may occur in human life, may be pronounced either a heinous sin, or a trifling offence, if not a blameless act; nor will in either case authorities be wanting to support the decision. By means of this contrivance the individual may at any time persuade himself that that which his passions or desires prompt him to do, may safely be done; and, lest this licence should be interfered with, the confessors of the order are directed to take this doctrine of moral probability for the rule of their determinations in administering the "Sacrament of penance," and that to such an extent as to make the decision of the penitent himself, if supported by a probable opinion, binding upon the confessor[9]. But however

persuaded himself, will perhaps sin; but he who says that the law is not binding, cannot sin. . . . . Consequently he who follows the less strict and the less probable opinion, cannot sin."—*Car. Ant. Casnedi, Cris. Theol. T.* ii. *Disp.* 10. *S.* 2. *par.* 2. *n.* 47. Extr. p. 120.

"It is lawful to follow the less probable opinion of another, in opposition to our own more probable opinion, which we still retain."—*M. Stoz, Trib. Pœnit. L.* i. *P.* 5. *Qu.* 2. *art.* 3. *n.* 112. Extr. p. 121.

"Even at the point of death it is lawful to follow a probable opinion, rejecting the more probable."—*Ibid. n.* 120. Extr. p. 123.

[9] "It may be asked whether a confessor may give advice to a penitent, in opposition to his own opinion? . . . I answer, that he lawfully may; because he may follow the opinion of another in his own practice; and therefore he may advise another person to follow it. Still it is better in giving advice, always to follow the more probable opinion, to which a man is ever accustomed to adhere; especially when the advice is given in writing, lest contradiction be discovered. It is also sometimes expedient to send the consulting person to another doctor or confessor, who is known to hold an opinion favourable to the enquirer, provided it be probable."—*Joann. de Salas, Disp. in primam Sec. D. Thomæ, T.* i. *Tr.* 8. *Disp. un. S.* 9. *n.* 84. Extr. pp. 87, 88.

"A doctor may give advice to a person who consults him, not only according to his own opinion, but even according to the opposite probable opinion of others, if the latter should be preferable or more favourable to the enquirer . . . although the same doctor should be certainly persuaded that the opinion is false in theory, so that he could not follow it in his own practice. . . . And hence it appears that a learned man may give contrary advice to different persons, according to contrary probable opinions; provided discretion and prudence be observed."—*Paul Laymann, Theol. Mor. Tr.* i. *c.* 5. § 2. *n.* 9. Extr. pp. 96, 97.

"If the confessor be the parish priest, or ordinary confessor of the penitent, he ought to absolve the penitent whom he perceives to follow a probable opinion, whether it be in the refusal of restitution, or in doing any other thing which should seem, in the opinion of the confessor, to be sinful, but which the penitent himself thinks lawful."—*Gabr. Vasquez, Comm. ac Disp. in prim. sec. D. Thomæ, T.* i. *Disp.* 62. *Q.* 19. *c.* 7. *art.* 6. Extr. p. 93.

"A confessor may lawfully follow the probable opinion of his penitent, and reject his own . . . And this is true, although the probable opinion which the penitent follows should be injurious to another, as in withholding restitution. For although Adrian asserts, that a confessor is bound to advise his penitent to abandon his opinion when it is prejudicial to another, yet it seems not to be said with reason; since the confessor, in the act of confession, is not bound to consider the advantage of a third person; and the penitent will not sin in following the probable opinion, even in withholding restitution."—*Nic. Baldel, Disp. ex Mor. Theol. L.* iv. *Disp.* 13. *n.* 5, 6. Extr. pp. 101, 102. ["If

great might be the latitude allowed in following probable opinions, it would have been of little avail, unless it could be made to appear, that those opinions had some reasonable foundation; it became therefore necessary so to define the nature of sin, as to make every individual act of sin susceptible of palliation by a variety of subtle distinctions. This was accomplished on the one hand by requiring for the establishment of sin, in the true and proper sense, such a concurrence, not only of the outward act and the inward disposition, but of deliberate forethought and wilful design[1], as is but rarely met with; the great majority of transgressions being the result of an evil instinct in man, and of the excitement of his passions; and on the other hand, by admitting as pleas in mitigation of sin a variety of collateral considerations, and among them not unfrequently such as constitute manifest aggravations of the original offence[2]. The character

"If a penitent should err only in the opinion of his confessor, and err perhaps unquestionably, but still pursue an opinion which is truly probable, his confessor is not obliged to reprove him; neither can he deprive him of the right which he possesses of following a probable opinion; and he should be judged according to it by the confessor, if he choose to persevere in it . . . After he has once heard him, he is obliged by his duty to absolve him, if he be in a suitable disposition of mind, provided there be no reasonable cause for delaying absolution; the resolution of adhering to a truly probable opinion, although the contrary opinion may be more probable, or more safe, or more remote from sin, not being in itself a sufficiently valid reason for deferring it."—*Joh. Martinon, Disp. Theol. T.* v. *de pœnit. Disp.* 53. *S.* 15. *n.* 190. Extr. p. 103.

"A confessor . . . is bound, under pain of mortal sin, to absolve a penitent who follows a probable opinion, which the confessor himself considers false."—*Georg. de Rhodes, Disp. Theol. Schol. T.* i. *De Act. hum. Disp.* 2. *Qu.* 2. *S.* 3. § 3. Extr. p. 118.

[1] "There is no deadly sin in the consent of the will, unless some thought or express consideration have preceded it . . . Therefore for a man to sin mortally, it is necessary that he should consider either that the action itself is evil, or that there is danger of sin, or that he should have some doubt upon it, or at least a scruple. But if none of these have preceded it, his ignorance, inadvertence, or forgetfulness, are accounted perfectly natural and invincible."—*Thom. Sanchez, Op. Mor. in præc. Decal. L.* i. *c.* 16. *n.* 21. Extr. p. 124.

"As long as the understanding does not reflect upon the wickedness of that which is offered to the will . . . the consent of the will is not a sin, because the sinfulness of it was not known; unless the inadvertence should have arisen from gross negligence, or from a depraved inclination to sin."—*Valer. Reginald, Praxis fori pœnit. L.* xi. *c.* 5. *S.* 3. *n.* 46. Extr. p. 125.

"Suarez, Sanchez, and Vasquez, are right, who maintain, that for an action to be imputed unto man for sin, which is sinful and forbidden by some law, it is necessary that the agent reflect, or have reflected upon the sinfulness of the action or the danger of the sin."—*Paul Laymann, Theol. Mor. L.* i. *Tr.* 2. *c.* 4. *n.* 6. Extr. p. 126.

"If a man commit adultery or murder, reflecting indeed, but only very imperfectly and superficially, upon the wickedness and great sinfulness of these crimes, however heinous may be the matter, he still sins but slightly. The reason is, that as a knowledge of the wickedness is necessary to constitute sin, so is a full and clear knowledge and reflexion necessary to constitute heinous sin."—*Georg. de Rhodes, Disp. Theol. Schol. T.* i. *De act. hum. Disp.* 2. *Qu.* 2. *S.* 1. § 2. Extr. p. 131.

[2] As for instance drunkenness: "The sins of blasphemy, perjury, and unfaith-

of sin, which is thus stripped of its intrinsic heinousness, is made to depend mainly upon the circumstances under which it is committed, and upon the view which the transgressor himself takes of it; he may have such particular occasions and motives of sin, he may be so hurried and so thoughtless, as to do away almost entirely with the sinfulness of his action; nay, he may by an obstinate, an "invincible" persuasion in his own mind, however erroneous in itself, turn wrong into right, and sin into virtue[3]; and lest so precious a privilege should be placed in jeopardy, the confessor is again specially enjoined to be careful how he disturbs his penitent from that salutary state of ignorance which neutralizes the sinful character of his actions[4].

By dint of these various fallacies and facilities, the casuists of the order, writing under its directions, and subject to its approbation, have managed to accumulate a mass of rules and decisions, one more iniquitous than another, the enormity of which surpasses all belief. They have discarded the first and great commandment, the love of God, in so many words, as superfluous[5];

fulness, committed in a state of drunkenness, either are not, or are, to be imputed unto sin. I think the former opinion sufficiently probable . . . to be guilty of such things in a state of intoxication is not sin, but the effect of sin."—*Ant. Escobar, Univ. Theol. Mor. recept. absque lite sentent. necnon problem. disquis. T.* i. *De Vit. Capit.* L. iv. *S.* 2. *pr.* 30. *n.* 246. Extr. p. 159. Compare also the case of a son murdering his father while in a state of intoxication, note 9, p. 78, several of the cases of Simony mentioned in note 9, p. 76, and the doctrine, that the injustice of his sentence exempts the judge from the obligation of restoring the bribe by which he was induced to pass it, note 1, p. 78.

[3] "It is certain that a full knowledge of the wickedness of the sin is required to constitute mortal sin. For it would be unworthy the goodness of God to exclude a man from glory and to reject him for ever, for a sin done without full deliberation; but if the perception of its wickedness be only half-full, there is no full deliberation; and consequently no mortal sin."—*Georg. de Rhodes, Disp. Theol. Schol. T.* i. *De Pecc. Disp.* i. *Qu.* 3. *S.* 2. § 3. Extr. p. 132.

"So far from being false, I hold it to be most true, that a man sins not, when he does that which he considers to be right, without any remorse or scruple of conscience."—*Car. Ant. Casnedi, Cris. Theol. T.* i. *Disp.* 7. *S.* 3. § 2. *n.* 149. Extr. p. 134.

"The converse law as it really exists in God, is this: obey an invincibly erroneous dictate of conscience; as often as you believe invincibly that a lie is commanded, lie . . . Let us suppose some Catholic to believe invincibly that the worship of images is forbidden: behold in that case the Lord Christ will have to say: 'Depart, thou cursed, &c., because thou hast worshipped my image' . . . So on the other hand it is no ways absurd to suppose, that the Lord Christ should say, 'Come, thou blessed, &c., because thou hast lied, invincibly believing that I in such a case commanded thee to lie.'"—*Car. Ant. Casnedi, Cris. Theol. T.* i. *Disp.* 6. *S.* 2. § 2. *n.* 78; *S.* 5. § 1. *n.* 165. Extr. p. 146.

[4] "A confessor perceives that his penitent is in invincible ignorance, or at least in innocent ignorance; and he does not hope that any benefit will be derived from his advice, but rather anxiety of mind, strife or scandal. Ought he to dissemble? Suarez affirms that he ought; because, since his admonition will be fruitless, ignorance will excuse his penitent from sin."—*Ant. Escobar, Lib. Theol. Mor.* xxiv. *Soc. Jesu. Doctor. reser. Tr.* vii. *Sacr. Ex.* iv. *de Pœnit. c.* 7. *n.* 155. Extr. p. 130.

[5] "An entire love of God is not due to him as a matter of justice, nor is even any due; though all love is due as a matter of decency and credit; because God is

they have distinctly abrogated the obligation of believing in God[6]; they have boldly proclaimed the lawfulness of idolatry[7]; they have declared an unworthy participation of the holy communion to be a sufficient compliance with Christ's command[8]; they have thrown the door wide open to simoniacal practices, under every circumstance of aggravation[9]; they have made theft a venial

of himself worthy of love, and a measure of it is due to him either through charity or some other virtue."—*Joh. de Salas, in prim. Sec. D. Thomæ, T.* i. *Qu.* 3. *Tr.* 2. *Disp.* 2. § 5. *n.* 40. Extr. p. 156.

"I think that the time in which this precept (the love of God) is binding, cannot easily be defined. It is certain indeed that there is an obligation; but at what precise time, is sufficiently uncertain."—*Jac. Gordon, Theol. Mor. Univ. T.* ii. *L.* vi. *Qu.* 13. *c.* 4. *art.* 2. *n.* 8. Extr. p. 156.

"In order to our justification we are obliged to love God. If the sacrament of penitence be not received, I grant this; if it be received, I deny it. And this is the privilege of the new grace which Christ has added, that, by virtue of the sacrament, justification may be obtained even without love."—*Busembaum, Theol. Mor. aucta a R. P. Cl. Lacroix. T.* vi. *L.* vi. *P.* ii. *Tr.* 4. *c.* 1. *Dub.* 2. *de contrit. Qu.* 119. *n.* 865. Extr. p. 168.

[6] "An unbeliever who is persuaded that his sect is probable, although the opposite sect may be more probable, would certainly be obliged at the point of death, to embrace the true faith which he thinks to be the more probable. But except under such circumstances he would not. . . . Add to this that the mysteries of faith are so sublime, and the Christian morals so repugnant to the laws of flesh and blood, that not any degree of greater probability may be accounted sufficient to enforce the obligation of believing."—*Th. Sanchez, Opus Mor. in præc. Decal. L.* ii. *c.* 1. *n.* 6. Extr. p. 90.

"It is probable to an unbeliever, that he holds the true religion, although the contrary may be more probable: there does not seem to be any obligation that he should renounce his error. But since at the point of death, there remains no longer time to examine the question, he is not on that account obliged to relinquish a safe way to follow one which is more safe; but only to examine the question with greater care, as far as the time will allow."—*Ferd. de Castro Palao, de Virt. et Vit. Contr. Pars* i. *Tr.* 4. *Disp.* 1. *p.* 12. *n.* 14. Extr. pp. 99, 100.

[7] "The more true opinion is, that all inanimate and irrational things may be legitimately worshipped."—*Gabr. Vasquez, de cultu adorat. L.* iii. *Disp.* 1. *c.* 2. Extr. p. 168.

"Without regarding in any way the dignity of the thing created, to direct our thoughts to God alone, while we give to the creature the sign and mark of submission, by a kiss or prostration, is neither vain nor superstitious, but an act of the purest religion."—*Ibid.* Extr. p. 170.

[8] "The divine positive precept which enjoins communion, ordains that it be received in a state of grace. This I deny. For that precept is fulfilled by an unworthy communion."—*Franc. de Lugo, Tract. de septem Eccl. Sacr. L.* iv. *de Euchar. c.* 10. *Qu.* 3. *n.* 30. Extr. p. 148.

[9] "It is not simony to pay what another has advanced or promised, to procure ordination for you, without your knowledge or against your will, or if the money have been given without your concurrence."—*Emm. Sa, Aphor. Confess. v. Simonia.* Extr. p. 137.

"Neither is it simony to give a benefice not principally, but secondarily, for a temporal advantage."—*Ibid.* Extr. p. 138.

"A doubt arises in the case in which a man should promise to give money for a benefice, not with an intention of really giving it, but feignedly; and if he should thus take the benefice, whether there would be simony? Sotus and Cajetan say that there would not, because the outward act partakes of the inward intention; wherefore, though the feigned promise were confirmed by a bond, there would be no simony."—*Franc. Tolet, Instr. Sacerd. L.* v. *c.* 90. *n.* 11. Extr. p. 139.

"If the payment be made in counterfeit money, the simony will not then be

offence, and superseded the duty of restitution[1], with special provisions for the encouragement of servants to rob their masters[2], and children their parents[3]; they have given the rein freely to carnal sins of every description[4]; they have left it doubtful whether suicide be a sin at all, or at most a trifling sin[5]; they have esta-

complete; because counterfeit coin is not a true payment."—*Busembaum, Theol. Mor. aucta a R. P. Cl. Lacroix. T.* ii. *L.* iii. *P.* i. *Tr.* 1. *c.* 2. *Dub.* 3. *Qu.* 46. *n.* 212. Extr. p. 142.

"Si res sacra detur tanquam pretium actus venerei, non autem ex gratitudine vel benevolentiâ tantummodo, tunc esset Simonia et Sacrilegium: sicut si quis conferret beneficium, vel eligeret, vel præsentaret aliquem tanquam pretium actus venerei habiti cum sorore. Dixi 'non autem ex gratitudine,' quia tunc nec Sacrilegium ullum esset, nec Simonia, sed tantum irreverentia quædam ad summum, re sacrâ et Deo dicatâ remunerando actum turpem et profanum."—*Vincent Filliucius, Mor. Quæst. de Christ. offic. et cas. Consc. T.* ii. *Tr.* 30. *c.* 7. *in VItum præc. Decal. n.* 130. Extr. p. 140.

[1] "Although, as Lessius says, it may seem difficult that theft should become venial, by reason of imperfect deliberation, yet it may sometimes happen. For some persons are so addicted to it through habit, and as it were determined to thieve, that they bear away the thing stolen before they fully reflect upon what they are doing. The same thing may happen through the violence of temptation, especially when it is committed with so much precipitancy, that there remains no time for deliberation."—*Joh. de Dicastille, De just. et jure., L.* ii. *Tr.* 2. *Disp.* 9. *Dub.* 2. *n.* 48. Extr. p. 129.

"It is not a mortal sin to take secretly from him who would give if he were asked, although he may be unwilling that it should be taken secretly; and it is not necessary to restore."—*Emm. Sa, Aphor. Confess. v. Furtum, n.* 7. Extr. p. 198.

"He who has stolen to a considerable amount, is not obliged under pain of mortal sin to restore the whole; but it is sufficient if he restore as much as will secure his neighbour from considerable loss."—*Franc. Amicus, Curs. Theol. T.* v. *Disp.* 38. *s.* 4. *n.* 47. Extr. p. 203.

"Trifling thefts committed on different days and at different opportunities, against one man or against many, however great may be the amount which has been stolen, will never become mortal sins."—*Steph. Bauny, Somme des Péchés; des Larcins. c.* 10. Extr. p. 204.

[2] "Servants are excused both from sin and restitution if they take for just compensation; if, for instance, when they are not furnished with necessaries for food and clothing such as in other houses usually are and ought to be provided for similar servants, they take so much and no more of their master's property as is necessary to compensate such an injury."—*Valer. Reginald, Praxis fori pœnit. T.* ii. *L.* xxv. *c.* 44. *n.* 555. Extr. p. 200.

[3] "A son who robs his father, is not accounted to sin mortally; 1. When he has a probable reason for believing that if his father were asked, he would grant him what he steals, without reluctance; for then the owner is not averse to the matter, but to the manner, of the transaction; 2. If the amount is not thought considerable in respect to his condition; 3. If he steals with the intent to give alms to one who is in great need; for then his parent is not reasonably averse to it; 4. If he robs his father to procure an innocent diversion suited to his rank."—*Jac. Gordon, Theol. Mor. Univ. T.* i. *L.* v. *Qu.* 3. *c.* 4. § 1. Extr. p. 201.

[4] We cannot defile our pages with any of the turpitudes which under this head are collected together in the Jesuit treatises on moral theology. Suffice it to say, that from the amount which may lawfully (*sic!*) be taken as the wages of prostitution, to the commission of the most horrible and unnatural crimes, nothing has escaped the disquisition of these casuists, and that the whole subject is handled in the same revolting spirit of palliating, excusing, nay sanctioning sin, which runs through their whole system of morality.

[5] "A man never sins unless he actually reflects upon the moral wickedness of

blished the lawfulness of murder, as a matter of probability in some cases, as a matter of certainty in others [6], more especially in the case of offenders against the papacy and the religious orders [7]; they have given the adulterer leave to slay the injured husband [8], and declared the son blameless if he kill his father in a drunken fit, allowing him even to rejoice at his consequent succession to the inheritance [9]; they have sanctioned corruption on the seat of judgment [1], and prevarication in the witness

the action or omission..... As if the mind, in a violent transport of anger or of grief, is so absorbed in the thought of what may be convenient or useful, that it either reflects not at all, or very slightly, upon the sinfulness and discredit of the action: in which case it will either be no sin, or only an imperfect and venial sin; which I think sometimes happens with those who are so completely absorbed in the excess of their sorrow, that they commit suicide."—*Paul Laymann, Theol. Mor. L.* i. *Tr.* 3. *c.* 5. *n.* 13. Extr. p. 126.

[6] "It is probable that it is never lawful for a private person directly to intend the death of another. Thus St. Thomas, &c. Yet the opposite opinion of many persons who are quoted and followed by Lessius, Diana, and de Lugo, is more common, and sufficiently probable."—*Busembaum, Theol. Mor. aucta a R. P. Cl. Lacroix. T.* ii. *L.* iii. *P.* 1. *Tr.* 4. *c.* 1. *Dub.* 3. *Qu.* 181. § 9. *n.* 821. Extr. p. 215.

"It is lawful for us to kill a man, when, if we kill him not, another will kill us."—*Steph. Fagundez, in præc. Decal. T.* i. *L.* 5. *c.* 6. *n.* 11. Extr. p. 208.

[7] "A man put under the pope's bann may be killed any where, as Filliucius, Escobar, and Diana teach; because the pope has jurisdiction, at least indirectly, over the whole world, even in temporal things, as far as is necessary for the administration of things spiritual, as all Catholics maintain, and as Suarez proves against the king of England."—*Busembaum, Theol. Moralis, aucta a R. P. Cl. Lacroix, T.* ii. *L.* iii. *P.* 1. *Tr.* 4. *c.* 1. *Dub.* 2. *Qu.* 178. § 4. *n.* 795. Extr. p. 260.

"It is lawful for an ecclesiastic, or one of a religious order, to kill a calumniator who threatens to spread atrocious accusations against himself or his order, when other means of defence are wanting."—*Franc. Amicus, Curs. Theol. Disp.* 36. *S.* 5. *n.* 118. Extr. p. 209.

[8] "If an adulterer, even though an ecclesiastic, aware of the danger, enter the house of an adulteress, and being attacked by her husband, kill his assailant in necessary defence of life and limb, it does not appear that he is irregular."—*Hen. Henriquez, Summ. Theol. Mor. T.* i. *Li.* xiv. *De Irregul. c.* 10. § 3. Extr. p. 206.

[9] Father Fagundez (*In Decal. Lib.* ix.) thus expresses himself: "It is lawful for a son to rejoice at the murder of his parent committed by himself in a state of drunkenness, on account of the great riches thence acquired by inheritance.... since it is supposed, on the one hand, that the parricide was blameless, as well from deficiency of deliberation caused by drunkenness, as through the absence of premeditation; and on the other, that very great riches would result from this parricide, an effect which is either good, or certainly not bad. It follows that the doctrine of Father Fagundez, which may seem a paradox, is true in theory, although it may be dangerous in practice.... He would be mistaken who should infer from what has been said, that for the sake of such results it would be lawful to desire voluntary drunkenness, or to rejoice in it. He would more rightly infer, that it is sometimes lawful to desire a blameless drunkenness, by which the great benefit would be produced. See *Caramuel*, in *Theologiâ Regulari*."—*George Gobat, Oper. Mor. T.* ii. *P.* ii. *Tr.* 5. *c.* 9. *s.* 8. *n.* 54, 55. 57. Extr. pp. 212, 213.

[1] "If the judge should think either opinion equally probable, for the sake of his friend he may lawfully pronounce sentence according to the opinion which is more favourable to the interest of that friend. He may, moreover, with the intent to serve his friend, at one time judge according to one opinion, and at another time according to the contrary opinion, provided only that no scandal result from the decision."—*Greg. de Valentia, Comm. Theol. T.* iii. *Disp.* 5. *Qu.* 7. *P.* 4. Extr. p. 89.

box[2]; they have abetted resistance to the civil magistrate, even to open murder and sedition[3]; they have made perjury a matter of harmless ingenuity[4]; they have established the papal supre-

"A judge may follow the less probable opinion, rejecting that which is more probable."—*Poignant, res. quæd. diff. ex judice.* Extr. p. 107.

"Is a judge bound to restore a bribe which he has received for pronouncing judgment? If he has received it for a just sentence, he is bound to restore it, because the sentence was otherwise due to the pleader, and he has therefore received no benefit for his money. If the judge has received it for an unjust sentence, he is not bound by natural right to make restitution, as Bannez, Sanchez, &c. teach, because he was not obliged to pronounce that unjust sentence; but this action is useful to the pleader, and the unjust judge exposes himself to great danger by it, especially in his reputation, if he should be convicted of injustice. Now the exposure to such danger in the service of another may be valued at a price."—*Busembaum, Theol. Mor. aucta a R. P. Cl. Lacroix, T.* iv. *L.* iv. *de Jud. c.* 3. *dub.* 2. *art.* 4. *qu.* 268. *n.* 1498. Extr. p. 197.

[2] "You believe that a judge examines you lawfully upon the crime of some great and honourable man, of high importance to the state; still you are not fully assured of it, but you have some scruple and some doubt. Then you may keep silence, and not answer him according to his meaning, deciding it to be probable in such a case that you may refrain from speaking . . . for in instances of this kind, a great necessity renders an opinion probable, which otherwise would not have been probable."—*Ferd. de Castro Palao, De Virt. et Vit. Contr. Pars* i. *Tr.* 1. *Disp.* 2. *p.* 2. *n.* 5. Extr. p. 98.

"If a judge examines concerning an action which has been committed without sin, at least without mortal sin, the witness and the accused are not obliged to answer according to the meaning of the judge."—*Leon. Lessius, de just. et jure, L.* ii. *c.* 31. *dub.* 3. *n.* 14. Extr. p. 192.

"There is no obligation to swear according to the meaning of the judge, but equivocation and mental reservation may be used."—*Ibid. n.* 17. Extr. p. 193.

[3] "Subjects are either excused or not excused from paying tribute in consequence of an opposite probable opinion. Certainly they are excused; for as the prince rightly levies tribute upon a probable opinion that it is just, so may the subject also rightly refuse the tribute upon a probable opinion that it is unjust."—*Sanchez ap. Ant. Escobar, Univ. Theol. Mor. T.* i. *L.* ii. *S.* 2. *p.* 18. *n.* 91, 92. Extr. p. 105.

"A subject who thinks that the command of his superior exceeds the limits of his authority, ought not to obey him."—*Louis de Scildere, de princ. consc. form. Tr.* ii. *c.* 4. *n.* 55. *ass.* 3. Extr. p. 110.

"If a judge were unjust, and had proceeded without adhering to the course of law, then the accused might by all means defend himself by assaulting and even by slaying the judge, because . . . in that case he cannot be called a judge, but an unjust aggressor and a tyrant."—*Steph. Fagundez, in præc. Decal. T.* ii. *L.* 8. *c.* 32. *n.* 5. Extr. p. 208.

"What is sedition? The disagreement of citizens, a special offence against charity. If the state is drawn away from its obedience to its prince, it is the crime of high treason; but if it extends only to the deposition of magistrates, it is simple sedition. Furthermore as against a tyrant it is no sin, nor sedition, properly speaking; because a tyrannical government aims not at the common weal."—*Ant. Escobar, Lib. Theol. Mor.* xxiv. *Soc. Jesu Doct. reser. Tr.* v. *Ex.* 5. *c.* 5. *n.* 69. Extr. p. 248.

[4] "Since you are not bound to swear according to the meaning of the enquirer, you may according to your own; which some deny, affirming that words which are absolutely false, are not excused by such an understanding of intention. There are learned men in favour of either opinion, who maintain either side with probability."—*Emm. Sa, Aphor. Confess. v. Juramentum, n.* 6. Extr. p. 186.

"It is not intrinsically wrong to use equivocation, even in making oath; whence

macy with all its practical consequences, as an article of the faith [5], and converted the duty of allegiance into a mere mockery [6], and regicide into a glorious achievement [7].

it is not always perjury. This is the sure and common opinion."—*Franc. Suarez, de Virt. et Statu Relig. T.* ii. *L.* iii. *de juram. præc. et pecc. eis contr. c.* 9. *ass.* 1. *n.* 2. Extr. p. 188.

"He would not sin mortally who, without deception, but, influenced by his reverence for an oath, and from scruple, should feign to swear, so that the bystanders and the notary might think that he did swear."—*Thom. Sanchez, Op. Mor. in præc. Decal. P.* ii. *L.* iii. *c.* 7. *n.* 2. Extr. p. 191.

"If there is a lawful cause for using equivocation or artifice in swearing, even though he to whom the oath is sworn should understand it in a sense different from that in which it is understood by him who swears it, and would thus be deceived, a mortal sin is not committed; and sometimes it does not even amount to a venial sin."—*Valer. Reginald, Praxis fori pœnit. T.* ii. *L.* xviii. *c.* 7. *S.* 1. *n.* 90. Extr. p. 191.

"Equivocation is nothing more than this, that the swearer understands the words in a sense different from that in which another person receives them. . . . It is not in itself a sin to use equivocation in swearing."—*Vinc. Filliucius, Mor. quæst. de Christ. offic. et cas. consc. T.* ii. *Tr.* 25. *c.* 11. *de juram. n.* 321, 322. Extr. p. 194.

"With what precaution is equivocation to be used? When, for instance, the swearer begins by saying, 'I swear that.' let him in a low voice insert the mental restriction 'to-day,' and then continue aloud, 'I have not eaten such a thing;' or, 'I swear,' inserting 'that I say,' then again finish aloud, 'that I have not done this or that;' for in this manner the entire speech is most true."—*Ibid. n.* 328. Extr. p. 195.

[5] "Princes are bound to obey the command of the pope as the word of Christ; and if they resist, he can punish them as rebellious persons, and if they undertake any thing against the Church and the glory of Christ, he may deprive them of their empire and kingdom, or he may transfer their dominions to another prince, and absolve their subjects from their allegiance which they owe to them, and from the oath which they have sworn; that the word of the Lord, which he spake to Jeremiah the prophet, may be verified in the Roman pontiff: 'Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth. See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out and to pull down, and to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant.'"—*Alph. Salmeron, Comm. in Ev. Hist. et in Acta App. T.* iv. *P.* iii. *Tr.* 4. *p.* 410. Extr. p. 220.

"We are not so timid and faint-hearted that we fear to affirm openly, that the Roman pontiff can, if occasion require, absolve Catholic subjects from their oath of allegiance, if the prince should use them tyrannically, and destroy the true religion; and we add, moreover, that if it be done discreetly and circumspectly by the pontiff, it is a meritorious work."—*Jac. Gretser, Vespert. Hæret. p.* 882. Extr. p. 256.

[6] "The rebellion of an ecclesiastic against a king is not a crime of high treason, because he is not subject to the king."—*Emm. Sa, Aphor. Confess. v. Clericus.* Extr. p. 216.

"The whole school of theologians and ecclesiastical lawyers maintain, (and it is both certain and a matter of faith,) that any Christian prince, if he has manifestly departed from the Catholic religion, and has wished to turn others from it, is immediately divested of all power and dignity, whether of divine or of human right, and that too even before the sentence pronounced against him by the supreme pastor and judge; and that all his subjects are free from every obligation of the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to him as their lawful prince; and that they may and must, if they have the power, drive such a man from the sovereignty of Christian men, as an apostate, a heretic, a deserter of Christ the Lord, and as an alien, and an enemy to his country, lest he corrupt others, and turn them from the faith by his example and command."—*Andr. Philopater, Resp. ad Edictum, S.* 2. *n.* 157. Extr. p. 217.

One might reasonably suppose that the exposure of these enormities must at once and for ever have ruined the character of the order in the estimation of the world, and put an end to its existence in every country in which there is, not to say any allegiance to the gospel, but any the least sense of moral right and wrong remaining. So far from it, the order has survived both the shock of the first exposure, which took place nearly two hundred years ago, and that of a judicial inquiry a century later, which ended in its expulsion from the different countries of the "Catholic" world; and it is now rapidly recovering its ground, not only in popish but in protestant countries, and more particularly in our own land, in spite of the many proofs which constantly transpire, that the order has not in any respect receded[8] from the moral atrocities of which it has again and again been proved guilty. By what means, then, have the Jesuits compassed this moral impossibility? By an "invincible" conviction on their part that it is their duty, *ad majorem Dei gloriam*, to lie, and to continue

"The sovereign pontiff, as the vicar of Christ and the superior of all Christendom, can directly annul and remit any obligation contracted with another upon the faith of an oath, when there is a just cause for it; which remission is no less valid than if it had been granted by the person himself in whose favour the oath was sworn."—*Leon. Lessius, de just. et jure, L.* ii. *de juram. c.* 42. *dub.* 12. *n.* 64. Extr. p. 242.

"Does a prince, by reason of his apostasy, lose his sovereignty over his subjects, so that they are no longer bound to obey him? No, because sovereignty and infidelity are not incompatible, and may subsist together; but the Church can deprive him of his sovereignty by a decree. Wherefore, as soon as he is declared excommunicate on account of his apostasy from the faith, his subjects are absolved from the oath of allegiance."—*Pet. Alagona, S. Thomæ Aquin. Summ. Theol. Comp. Ex. Sec. Sec. qu.* 12. Extr. p. 244.

[7] "When the state is oppressed by the tyranny of the prince, and the people are deprived of the power of assembling, the will is not wanting to abolish the tyranny, or to avenge the manifest and intolerable crimes of the prince, and to restrain his mischievous efforts: as if he should overthrow the religion of the country, and introduce a public enemy within the state. I shall never consider that man to have done wrong, who favouring the public wishes, would attempt to kill him."—*Joh. Mariana, De rege et regis Instit. L.* i. *c.* 6. p. 61. Extr. p. 224.

"It is useful that princes should be made to know, that if they oppress the state, and become intolerable by their vices and their pollution, they hold their lives upon this tenure, that to put them to death is not only lawful, but a laudable and a glorious action."—*Ibid.* Extr. p. 225.

[8] As regards the political perfidy of the order, and the seditious tendency of its influence upon the people, the present state of Ireland, the attitude which popish priests and agitators have assumed, and the impossibility of bringing the law of the land to bear upon the open outrages committed against the peace of the realm and the lives and properties of individuals, can leave no doubt on the mind of any unprejudiced person, that the principles set forth in the latter portion of the preceding extracts are in full force and active operation to this day; and in reference to all the other heads of casuistry, the hand-books of moral theology recently published in France for the use of the ecclesiastical seminaries, which are mostly under Jesuit management, and all under Jesuit influence, afford more than sufficient evidence that the art "*de chicaner avec Dieu*," as it has been wittily called, is not likely to be lost for want of cultivation.

to lie, in spite of whatever evidence may be adduced against them. With the world at large they content themselves to ridicule, as preposterous and beneath contempt, the notion that a religious order, so austere, so influential, so respectable as theirs, should give countenance to such corruptions. With those who will not be *pooh-pooh'd* in this manner, who appeal to the law and the testimony of the order itself, they reply—1. That the evidence against them is made up of misquotations and garbled extracts. 2. That the society is not answerable for the opinions of its individual members; and 3. That the principles which have been made the subject of such violent accusations against them, are not exclusively maintained by the Jesuits, but were inculcated in the schools of "Catholic theology," long before the order of Jesuits came into existence.

As regards the first of these apologetic pleas, it is undoubtedly true that the Jesuits have in a few instances succeeded in making out a case of verbal inaccuracy against their opponents; but the instances are so few, and in themselves so trivial, that considering the numberless quotations, the accuracy of which is undeniably established, the main question is not in the least affected by them; nor should it, in connexion with this point, be forgotten that the Jesuits have, by the most barefaced denials and the most impudent falsehoods[9], repeatedly endeavoured to throw dust in the eyes of the public, and have by this mode of defence afforded a further illustration of that total disregard of truth which is so prominent a feature in their system of morality.

With regard to the second plea, the constitutions of the Jesuits themselves witness against them; they subject all the writings of members of the order to the strictest scrutiny, and prohibit, under severe penalties, their publication otherwise than

[9] See detailed proofs of this in the 13th, 14th, and 15th of the *Lettres Provinciales*," as far as the controversy with Pascal is concerned. The most daring attempt of this kind which the Jesuits ever made, was their reply to the *Extraits des Assertions.* In their *Réponse au Recueil intitulé, Extraits des Assertions* (see *Documents Historiques*, &c. vol. II. No. 9.) they made it appear as if those passages consisted for the most part of falsifications; but a great number of them have been collated in this country, and the substantial correctness of the citation has been established in every instance where the volume could be found in the libraries of the two universities, of the British Museum, and of Sion College. Another, and a signal instance of the fraudulent practices to which the Jesuits have recourse for the purpose of escaping from the evidence against them, furnished by their own writers, is related by M. Génin (p. 22, 23.) from the manuscript negotiations of the nuntio Spada. (*Biblioth. du Roi*, No. 9938.) When the five propositions of Sanctarella, respecting the temporal supremacy of the pope and his right to depose kings and to dispose of their dominions, provoked the resistance of the French king and parliament, the general of the Jesuits, Vitelleschi, forwarded to the Jesuits at Paris, for circulation among the uninitiated, two copies of Sanctarella's book, (which was very scarce in France,) in which the obnoxious chapters were suppressed, with a view to mislead public opinion as to the real merits of the question.

by permission of the general[1], so that the society is to be held, most justly, responsible for all the statements of its members; especially when it is considered that whatever may be at any time the employment of any individual Jesuit, is so by the express sanction, if not by command, of his superior; so that no individual Jesuit can write, much less publish, digests of moral theology without the commission and the sanction of the order. The occasional disclaimers put forth by the Jesuits in their controversial and apologetic writings are therefore perfectly valueless, as the conduct of the society on more than one occasion clearly proves. Thus, for instance, when their doctrine on regicide had caused a general outcry against the order, when Henry III. had been murdered, and the life of Henry IV. attempted by Jean Chastel, when the gunpowder plot had been discovered in England, when two members of the order had suffered the extreme penalty of the law, one in Paris, the other in London, as accessories before the fact, not without abundant proof of treason in both cases, General Aquaviva thought it expedient on the 6th of July 1610, to publish a stringent decree, for the suppression of the regicide doctrines[2]. Notwithstanding this, however, care was taken to place the names of both Jean Guignard[3] and Henry Garnett in their martyrology, and to have the latter even canonized; and to this day the manuals of *theologia moralis*, composed by Jesuits and their copyists, propound, under the title *tyrannicidium*, the infamous doctrine which places the life of every sovereign who is considered as an enemy of the order and of the Roman Church, at the disposal of any fanatic who may be bold enough to stake his life *ad majorem Dei gloriam*. But the most striking proof of the countenance given by the society as a body to the infamous moral teaching of its casuists, is the fact, that in the only two instances in which the machinery which the society possesses for controlling the general in the exercise of his despotic power, was brought into operation, the opposition of the society against its chief was

[1] "Let us be of the same mind, and, as much as possible, all speak the same thing, as saith the apostle. Let no difference of doctrine be permitted, neither by word of mouth in public sermons or lectures, nor in written books, which shall not be allowed to be made public without the approbation and consent of the general; who shall cause them to be examined by at least three persons of sound doctrine and clear judgment concerning the matter."—*Const. P.* iii. *c.* 1. § 18.—*P.* iv. *c.* 6. § 16. *Decl. O.*—This rule was subsequently enforced by severe punishments, by removal from office, degradation, and even corporal chastisement, and that not only in the persons of the authors, but of their superiors, for not preventing them.—*Congr.* xi. *Decr.* 32.

[2] Crétineau-Joly. T. ii. p. 420.

[3] This fact was denied by the Jesuit *Richeome* in his reply to the *Anti-Coton*, who asserted it (pp. 18, 19). It appears that two editions of the Jesuit Martyrologium were printed at the time, and in one of them, which was intended for France, the name of Father Guignard was omitted from the list of martyrs, while in the other it was inserted.—*Bayle, Dict. Hist. et Crit. v. Guignard.*

provoked by attempts to restrain the laxity of the moral theology of the order. The first of these cases was that of Goswin Nickel, who, alarmed probably by the effect which the *Lettres provinciales* produced, set himself to reform the order, but was removed from power, and Oliva substituted in his place [4]. The second was that of Gonzalez, who, while yet in a private station, wrote in opposition to the lax casuistry of the order; but his work was condemned by five examiners, and suppressed by order of General Oliva. Having, after the death of Oliva's successor, been himself raised to the generalship, chiefly through the influence of Innocent XI. who shared his sentiments, he succeeded with much difficulty in obtaining from the XIIIth Congregation an ambiguous decree [5], allowing the advocacy of stricter opinions, and he afterwards managed to get his book printed. But he had a narrow escape of sharing the fate of his predecessor Nickel; the assistants threatened to proceed against him, with a view to his removal, which would certainly have been effected but for the powerful support which Gonzalez received both from the pope and the Emperor.

As regards the third allegation, that the casuistry so much reprobated was not invented by the Jesuits, however serviceable it might be to them in controversy with Romish writers, it is evident that not only it does not weaken our argument, but that it greatly strengthens it; for what we maintain, and have been endeavouring to demonstrate, is precisely this, that Jesuitism is nothing else than popery in a more concentrated and more effective form.

[4] Goswin Nickel was superseded by the XIth Congregation, which appointed Oliva perpetual vicar-general during his lifetime, with succession after his death. The cause of this proceeding, as it appears on the face of the records, was the increasing age and infirmity of the general, which he himself stated at the opening of the congregation, and then withdrew altogether from its deliberations. The actual fact is, that he entertained plans of reform unpalatable to the majority, who virtually deposed him from his office, though he continued in it nominally until his death, three years later. The concealment of the real state of the case in the published decrees of the congregation, (which are, like the decrees of all the congregations laid before the world, a part only of the decrees actually passed,) is in strict accordance with the Constitutions, in which it is expressly provided that all proceedings against the general are to be kept a profound secret, and if it be thought necessary to remove him, endeavours are to be used to obtain his resignation, and by this compromise to conceal the matter.

[5] This decree is as follows: "It having been reported to the congregation, that some persons believed the society as a body to have given its countenance to the opinions of the doctors, who hold that the less probable opinion favourable to liberty, may in practice be followed in preference to the more probable opinion which supports the commandment, the congregation thought fit to declare, that the society neither has prohibited, nor does prohibit, any one from maintaining the contrary opinion, if it appear to him preferable."—*Cong.* xiii. *Decr.* xviii. (in MS. 45, 46, 47, 48.)

We have completed the task we had proposed to ourselves; we have examined the Jesuit order by the aid of its own documents, of the facts authenticated by itself. We have sought for its origin in the necessities of the times in which it rose; we have seen the complexion it wore in the mind of its founder; we have traced the process by which a number of living souls are emptied of their life, and strung together into one huge skeleton of dead members; we have ascertained by what subtle devices it lays hold of the living masses of humanity around it, for the purpose of clothing itself with their flesh, and making them move according to its will; we have laid bare the fearful iniquity of its moral code, to the utter abrogation of all laws, human and divine, whenever they may militate against the interests of the order. We have found Jesuitism to be a gigantic power, but a power whose strength is death, whose breath is corruption; a power raised up with Satanic skill, for the purpose of destroying Christ's life in individuals and in nations, and enthroning the lie of Rome in the hearts in which the Spirit of truth should reign.

To follow the movements of this body through the three centuries of its past existence, what an interesting task! But that we must, for the present at least, forego. We have room only to notice one leading fact, which runs through the history of the order in all parts of the world; and that is, that none of their counsels ever prospered, none of their works ever endured, for any length of time. Their power rose now here, now there, and at one time over the whole earth, to a fearful height; but suddenly, as if smitten by an invisible hand, it fell. It has risen again, with giant strength, and, we doubt not, it will again prepare the way for its own downfal.

What, then, have we to fear? Nothing, as far as regards the ultimate success of the Jesuit system, or the ultimate triumph of the papal power, whose tool it is. But every thing as regards the treasures of family and national life, the treasures of Apostolic Christianity, with which the goodness of God has hitherto blessed us. If the Jesuits be permitted to strike their fangs into the life of our Church and nation, we are undone. "A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth."

The enemy is closing in upon us; he has already gained a firm footing in many a place where our defences once stood. The Jesuit is going to and fro in the land, walking up and down in it. In masked ubiquity he surveys the field and watches his opportunity. He has found him a place in the senate-house and at the council-board; he agitates Ireland, and keeps England in uneasy suspense; he stirs up the hatred of France against us, and sows in our colonies the seeds of discord and disloyalty.

He has even ventured to go a step further; he has begun to teach in our schools, and to influence our pulpits; the quiet of our universities, the peace of our Church is disturbed.

There is but one chance of escape for us. The nation must be aroused from the slumber of a treacherous prosperity, from the dreamy visions of a false liberality. We must fall back upon the ancient creed of our land; we must again believe, in good earnest, as once we did believe it, when the blood of martyrs attested the nation's faith, that there is but one God, and one Lord, and one Spirit, and one holy truth; that that truth is a principle of life to be held sacred in the nation's conscience, and to be worked out boldly in the nation's life. We must not with hands uplifted only, but with hearts devoted, appeal to Him who alone is mighty to save, and say: "Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of the Lord; awake, as in the ancient days, in the generations of old!"

ART. III.—1. *Aegypten's Stelle in der Weltgeschichte; Geschichtliche Untersuchung in fünf Büchern, von* CHRISTIAN CARL JOSIAS BUNSEN. (The position of Egypt in the history of the world; an historical enquiry in five books, by C. C. J. BUNSEN, Doctor of Philosophy and of Law; Honorary Member of the Royal Academy of Science of Berlin, and of the Royal Society of Literature of London; general Secretary of the Archæological Institute of Rome.) Two first books, and two first sections of the third, with a supplementary volume of Records. 8vo. Hamburg, 1845.

2. *Operations carried on at the Pyramids of Gizeh in* 1837, *by* COLONEL HOWARD VYSE; three volumes. 8vo. With large Atlas in folio. London, 1840—1842.

THE object and the age of those stupendous masses of masonry, which lie between the Libyan desert and the Nile, a little before the waters of the latter are parted at the summit of the Delta, have been alike subjects of controversy. With respect to their use, as many different opinions have been entertained as with respect to that of the round towers in our sister island. Not content with the simple statement of Herodotus, that they were the sepulchres of ancient kings, various writers have imagined that their recesses were designed for the celebration of mysteries, like those of Eleusis or of Samothrace; or, more absurdly still, that they were intended for astronomical observations, or for granaries; their immensity being accounted for by the wish to give employment to an idle people, or to squander superfluous treasures. Again, as to the period of their erection, Herodotus was informed, if he did not misunderstand his Egyptian authorities, that it was subsequent to that of the conquests of Sesostris and of the building of the principal temples. Calculating from his statements, the reign of Cheops, the reputed builder of the largest pyramid, commenced about 900 B.C. Diodorus Siculus takes a similar view of the matter; and so in our own times does Mr. Sharpe. On the other hand, the fragments of Manetho, preserved by Africanus and Eusebius, represent the pyramids as the work of very ancient kings, who reigned long before those by whom the greater part of the other monuments in existence were constructed. Most of the recent writers on Egyptian affairs

have adopted this opinion; and, without pretending to assign the exact dates of the reigns of their builders, have placed them 2000 years, at the least, before the Christian era.

We have now before us two works, which go a great way towards settling all disputed points connected with these wonderful monuments. No well-informed person will now venture to deny that the pyramids were designed to contain the remains of the kings who built them, or of members of their families; or that these kings were among the earliest of those who have left any monuments. The author of one of these works pretends to have ascertained the exact dates when their several builders reigned; and they are such as, he has no hesitation in avowing, are irreconcilable with the chronological statements of Moses. On this point, we will before we conclude state our reasons for dissenting from him; but we will first lay before our readers some of the interesting facts relating to the pyramids, which have been recently brought to light; and before we do this we must say something respecting the sources from which we derive our information.

The latter of the two works which we are reviewing, contains the record and the result of a series of operations at the pyramids, scientifically planned with a view to ascertain in the most accurate manner the dimensions and the internal structure of each of them, and executed with a liberality as to expenditure, which is, we believe, without a parallel in modern times. We understand that these operations cost Col. Howard Vyse no less a sum than 10,000*l.*; a princely contribution, indeed, for a private individual to make to a public object! Not content, however, with merely giving this large sum of money, although he had secured the services of an eminent engineer, Mr. Perring, to conduct his operations, he remained on the spot, himself, an entire year, exposed to the manifold inconveniences and annoyances of Egyptian life.

The other work which we have before us, if it does not record the labours of its author, in personally exploring the monuments of Egyptian antiquity, shows that he has been a most attentive observer of what others have done in this way. To the results of their researches he has applied that architectural skill, which had previously enabled him to throw so much new light on certain antiquities of Rome; and he has thus made discoveries at home, which escaped those who had laboured in Egypt. This, however, is but a small part of what Chevalier Bunsen flatters himself that he has accomplished in the work before us. From the short sketch of it which we are about to give, it will be evident that one of higher pretensions has seldom been under-

taken. Most of our readers will probably agree with us in thinking, that much of what the author proposes to execute in his fifth book is beyond the power of uninspired man. It is not here alone, however, that we think he will be found to have failed in his undertaking. We regard his Egyptian chronology as having no foundation in reality. While we look up to him as furnishing interesting information respecting individual kings and their monuments, we are not disposed to acquiesce in the order in which he arranges these kings; and still less can we believe in the authenticity of the dates, which he assigns with so much confidence to the commencements of their several reigns. Our reasons for incredulity on these points will be given in the latter part of this article. We will not now detain our readers any longer from an account of this most interesting and important work.

It consists, or, we should rather say, it will consist, should it ever be completed, of five books, bearing the names of five literary heroes. The first book, which is introductory, bears the name of NIEBUHR, whom our author venerates as the best model in the department of historical criticism. By naming it after him, he tells us that he would be understood as expressing his conviction, that "the true seal and sure attestation of genuine criticism lies not in the annihilation, but in the recognition and restoration of history."

This book consists of six sections. The first three of them are introductory to the three following books, which treat of the period that commenced with Menes, who, according to our author, first reigned over the entire of Egypt, in 3643 B.C. From that time downwards, he affirms that the Egyptians had a chronology, as far, at least, as respects the leading events of their history, which is more to be depended on than that of the Romans, until long after the building of the city, or than that of the Greeks, until long after the origin of the Olympiads! These sections treat respectively of the historical tradition and investigation of the Egyptians; of the investigation of the Greeks concerning Egyptian chronology; and of the tradition and investigation of the Jews, and the investigation of the Christians of different countries, concerning Egyptian times. It may be right to apprise our readers that, in the language of Chevalier Bunsen, the *tradition* of the Jews includes those historical books of the Old Testament which were written in the times of which they treat. Their *investigation* comprehends all which relates to times anterior to the writer. Under this head he places the book of Genesis, the discourse of St. Paul at Antioch in Pisidia, and the Archæology of Josephus; and he rejects, almost contemptuously, the

supposition that either tradition or investigation was ever guided by Divine Inspiration. The remaining sections of the first book treat of the language, the mode of writing, and the mythology of the Egyptians; or, to translate our author's titles more literally, of the fashioning of their speech, their writing, and their gods. They are introductory to the yet unpublished, and we believe unwritten, fifth book, in which these guides are to be followed in tracing back the human race from Menes to its origin.

The second book, ERATOSTHENES, contains a restoration of the chronology of the Old Egyptian kingdom, that which preceded the invasion of the Shepherds; which is chiefly founded on the catalogue of Theban kings, attributed to the author whose name it bears. It is in this book that our author describes the different pyramids, arranging them in the order in which he supposes their builders to have reigned.

The third book, MANETHO, of which only a part is yet published, treats of the middle and the new kingdoms; those concurrent with, and subsequent to, the domination of the Hykshos or Shepherds; and here, as in the preceding instance, the name given to the book is that of the author on whose statements the chief dependence is placed. The part of this book which is already published contains a restoration of the chronology of the entire period; but no monuments belonging to any part of it are yet described; and, consequently, there is no test within our reach, by which the soundness or unsoundness of the alleged restoration can be ascertained. This will be a sufficient reason for noticing very briefly this portion of our author's work.

The fourth book is to be called CHAMPOLLION; and will contain a connected view of the chronological results obtained in the two preceding ones, together with verifications of them derived both from the heavens and from the earth;—from the determination of "infallible astronomical epochs," and from historical synchronisms. The discoveries of Champollion in the former department are spoken of as most brilliant and important, though scarcely known out of France. We presume he alludes to his alleged discoveries respecting the epoch when the year of 365 days must have been introduced. If so, we can have no hesitation in pronouncing them to be altogether visionary. His arguments are no other than what were put forward in the first instance, from recollection of his lost papers, by M. Biot; and they have been refuted in a paper "On the years and cycles used by the ancient Egyptians," contained in the 18th volume of the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy.

The first four books are only preparatory to the fifth, which is looked forward to as their end and their reward. In it he pro-

poses to consider questions of a higher order. He will first endeavour to trace the early history of Egypt, in connexion with that of the human race, through those old times before chronology existed, the sole records of which are language and mythology; —those two poles, as he fancifully styles them, by the alternate electrical action of which the knowledge of a people is formed. He will then descend through the long succession of centuries, the existence of which he supposes that he has ascertained; exhibiting the history of the world in connexion with, and as a developement of, that of Egypt. The hero after whom this wonderful book is to be called is SCHELLING; who, in our author's judgment, laid the foundation of the true philosophy of history.

From this brief analysis of Chevalier Bunsen's work, which we have felt it due to him to give, we pass to the subject which he appears to us to have treated in the most satisfactory manner; we mean THE PYRAMIDS.

Every one has heard of the three pyramids of Gizeh, which, in ancient and in modern times alike have been classed among the wonders of the world. Most persons are, we presume, aware that, though the most remarkable, these are by no means the only pyramids in Egypt; but few know the precise number remaining, or are acquainted with their arrangement in groups. Mr. Perring reckons thirty-seven, exclusive of those at Biahmoo, of which only a few stones remain together, and which are believed to have supported statues; and of that called El Koofa[1], one of those built in steps, which lies far to the south of the others. Of these thirty-seven the most northern is situated in N. lat. 30°2′20″. This is the ruined pyramid of Aboo Röásh, of which only the base is remaining. The most southern is at Illahoon in N. lat. 29°16′56″. A bird's flight from one of these extremes to the other would be between 54 and 55 English miles. The most northern group is that of Gizeh; so called from a village opposite Cairo, where travellers who visit these pyramids usually land. The name signifies "the passage." The Egyptians commonly pronounce the initial letter hard; but Arab scholars consider it incorrect to do so. This group is four or five miles to the south of the ruined pyramid already mentioned, and something more than five miles from the village; it contains six small pyramids in addition to the Three. The next group to the south of this, distant from it near six miles, is that of Abouseer, which includes four pyramids. Two others stand between the

[1] We adopt Mr. Perring's orthography, though it makes no pretension to correctness. The proper mode of spelling the Arabic names of Egyptian villages is often very doubtful, and seldom of any importance.

two groups, and are called after the neighbouring villages of Zowyet el Arrian and Reegah. The Sakkara group commences about two miles to the south-east of the preceding, and contains eleven pyramids, scattered through a space of about two miles long. Further south are the pyramids of Dashoor, five in number. From the most southern pyramid of this group to the great pyramid at Gizeh is about twelve English miles, in which are reckoned thirty-one pyramids, of different sizes, and in different degrees of preservation. They lie to the west of the site of Memphis. At Lisht, twelve miles south of the Dashoor group, there are two pyramids; and another near Meydoom, about the same distance south of these. Between this and the pyramids of Lisht, near a village called from them El Ahrâm, or the Pyramids, there were formerly the remains of two pyramids, which Mr. Perring has omitted. He has also omitted two in the Sakkara group, besides the Mustamet el Faroon, or "Pharaoh's throne," which he does not consider to be a true pyramid. And, indeed, we have observed in the accounts of the older travellers mention of several others, chiefly small ones, all trace of which seems now to have passed away. Most of the Egyptian monuments are, we grieve to say, rapidly disappearing; the stones of which they are built being used in modern buildings, or burned for lime. The most southern pyramid, that of Illahoon, stands in the opening of the Lybian hills which communicates with the Fayyoom; and about seven miles from this, up the valley to the north west, is the pyramid of Howara or of the Labyrinth. Chevalier Bunsen pronounces nine of these pyramids to have been intended for kings' wives or children; namely, five in the Gizeh group, two in that of Sakkara, and one in each of those of Dashoor and Abouseer. On the other hand, one at least—probably two—of the Gizeh pyramids contained the bodies of two sovereigns. The great pyramid also of Sakkara, which has several apartments in its interior, may have been the tomb of many kings; though it seems more likely that it was intended only for the builder and his wives. It would appear, then, that at least thirty Egyptian kings were buried in pyramids;—how many more there may have been it is impossible to say, but it is not likely that there were many; as the destroyed pyramids were for the most part too small to have been intended for kings.

The classification of the pyramids in groups is of some importance; as Chevalier Bunsen justly supposes that the kings of one family would have their sepulchres contiguous. If, therefore, one pyramid in a group can be assigned on satisfactory grounds to a king whose place in the series is known, a very probable conjecture may be formed respecting the builders of other pyramids

in the same group, especially if they be similar to it in material and construction. This is particularly the case with the three large pyramids of Abouseer; and from observations made on the direction of an ancient causeway, it appears that the third or southernmost of these pyramids was erected before the second. The first and second of these pyramids exhibited the names of their builders on stones in their interior; and when these kings shall have their places in the royal succession ascertained, it will be easy to determine, with a high degree of probability at least, by whom the third of these pyramids was built, and by whom the foundations of a pyramid in its neighbourhood were laid; who was doubtless one of the same family, with a very short reign. *As yet*, however, we cannot think that the places of the builders of these pyramids are known. Chevalier Bunsen in the body of his work supposes the first or northern one to belong to Biyres, the ninth king of the third dynasty; but in his prefatory post-script he refers it to Sirius, the sixth king of the same dynasty. The middle pyramid he gives to Rasosis the eighth king of this dynasty. Of course, he assigns the southern one to Chnubos, the seventh king.

As we expect to be able to show that the Chevalier's system of arranging these ancient kings is fundamentally and altogether erroneous, we need not bring forward any special reasons for objecting to this particular part of it. We believe, however, that it would not be difficult to prove that the Abouseer pyramids were built subsequently to the Gizeh group; which is the reverse of what our author supposes. If the true order of these ancient kings shall ever be completely ascertained, it will probably be by help of the inscriptions on the tombs of individuals who held offices under them. Some tombs contain the names of several kings; and the order of their succession may be indicated by the inscription in which they occur. Unfortunately, those who have examined these tombs have hitherto been for the most part satisfied with copying the royal shields without the accompanying hieroglyphics. Mere names of kings are of no value; nor can much dependence be placed on a series of royal names, if each be followed by the characters signifying prophet. The tenant of the tomb would in such cases be styled the prophet of the kings named; but this appears not to indicate a sacerdotal office, which he held under those kings when living, but one which he held in reference to them when dead and venerated as gods. A number of such kings might, therefore, be arranged, not in the order in which they had reigned, but in that of the appointments of the individual to their several prophetships. If, however, the name of the king under whom an individual lived be directly

stated, or if it can be inferred from his having given his children names, of which his master's name formed a part; and if he be also stated to have been prophet of one or more kings, we can safely conclude that the latter must have preceded the former. It is understood that the Prussian expedition under Dr. Lepsius has collected a large number of inscriptions from tombs, containing royal names, which have been accurately copied. They will probably, when published, furnish data by which the royal succession may be determined to a great extent. In the meantime it is useless to indulge in conjectures.

Of the pyramids which we have enumerated, some are of stone, and some of brick. It is natural to suppose that one or other of these kinds was in use before the other, and was superseded by it. If so, one would think that the positive statement of Herodotus, grounded on an inscription which existed in his time on a brick pyramid, would suffice to establish the claim of the stone pyramids to priority of erection. "Do not despise me," the brick pyramid is supposed to say, "in comparison with those pyramids of stone, for I am as much superior to them as Jupiter is superior to the other gods. Poles were plunged into the lake; of the mud which adhered to them bricks were formed; and thus was I made." To us it appears evident that the superiority here claimed for this pyramid over the stone ones consisted only in its material. It was not *absolutely* larger, or better built than they, but it was superior to them *as a work of art*, as its builder thought, or pretended to think, on account of its being made of a material more difficult to obtain. We should infer from this that the pyramid here spoken of was the first that was made of brick, and that most, if not all, of the stone pyramids had been previously built. Such, however, is not the construction put upon the passage by Mr. Perring and Chevalier Bunsen. Mr. Perring, supposing the northern brick pyramid of Dashoor to be the pyramid in question, understood the inscription as implying that this was a finer object than the stone pyramids of Dashoor in its immediate neighbourhood, which in point of fact it is. To the other pyramids he did not conceive that any allusion was made. We think Mr. Perring decidedly wrong, first in his interpretation of the inscription on the pyramid of Asychis; and secondly, in identifying the pyramid of Dashoor with it; but we must admit that he has advanced a consistent hypothesis. Not so with the Chevalier. Agreeing with Mr. Perring in other points, he represents the stone pyramids of Dashoor to be the tombs of kings subsequent to Asychis, or, as he calls him, Sasychis. To what stone pyramids then can he suppose that the author of the inscription alluded? The notion of this being one of the earliest

of the pyramids appears to us inconsistent with all the facts of the case. It has the remains of a temple in its front, such as the Ethiopian pyramids have, and as no other Egyptian pyramids has. Consequently, as the supposition that Egypt was colonized from Ethiopia, or originally derived its arts from thence, has been shown by Dr. Lepsius to be without foundation, we are led to place the erection of this pyramid subsequently to the conquest of Ethiopia, which took place in the reign of Osortasen I. With this the sculptures found in the interior of the pyramid agree, being such as are met with on monuments of the twelfth dynasty; and with this the fragment of a royal shield, found along with them, also agrees. Chevalier Bunsen has completed it, so as to form a name, which, he says, *may be read* Sesercheres-Mares, and may thus represent at the same time the Sasychis of Herodotus (as restored) and the Mares of Eratosthenes; but we think that the Chevalier's restored shield has very little of the appearance of a genuine Egyptian shield; and we have no doubt at all that the fragment in question made a part of the prænomen, either of Amenemhe II., or of Osortasen III.—probably the latter, as it is the exact conclusion of both of these.

It is probable that this error in respect to the brick pyramids would have been avoided, if the chamber in the pyramid of the labyrinth had been reached by Mr. Perring. Unfortunately that gentleman was prevented by circumstances from opening this pyramid; he only ascertained that the pretended opening of it by M. Malus was a hoax. This person had stated in conversation that he had opened it, and found in its central chamber *a salt spring*. Soon after this, before he drew up a written account of his proceedings, he fell sick and died. The consequence has been that this idle tale has gained credit, and has been copied into one of our best modern accounts of the pyramids. Chevalier Bunsen, in the body of his work, supposed that this pyramid was the tomb of Smenteti, whose name has been corrupted to Pemphos, partly by the informants and partly by the copyists of Eratosthenes; the process of corruption is traced by our author through six intermediate forms! He was the fourth king after Menes, and this was the oldest of the pyramids that have been preserved. After this was printed, an account came that Dr. Lepsius had penetrated into this pyramid, and found in its chamber, as the name of its tenant, that of — Amenemhe III. Accordingly, in his prefatory postscript, our author has had to remove this pyramid from the *very first* in the chronological series to the *very last!* Osortasen III., to whom we would ascribe the northern brick pyramid at Dashoor, was the father of this king; and we entertain little or no doubt that most, if not all, of the

remaining brick pyramids are the tombs of the immediate predecessors of these kings. Independently of the testimony of Herodotus, and of the surer evidence of the hieroglyphics found within the two pyramids mentioned, when we consider that all the brick pyramids which remain appear to have been coated with hewn stone, the hypothesis that these were older than the stone pyramids appears to us exceedingly improbable.

Chevalier Bunsen, in acknowledging that the pyramid of the labyrinth was the tomb of Amenemhe III., remarks that he does so in defiance not only of the statement of Herodotus, but of that of "the surest authority in historical matters, Manetho, who relates in plain terms, that 'this king built the labyrinth in the Arsinoite nome for his grave.'" We cannot see the inconsistency of this statement with the facts. We take it for granted that Manetho considered the labyrinth to include its pyramid; just as, when we speak of a church, we include its steeple. Pliny expressly describes the labyrinth as *comprehending* (complectens) a pyramid. The Chevalier's description of the labyrinth is most interesting and satisfactory. We have only room to say that he considers it to have been of a quadrangular form, containing twenty-seven palaces, fourteen on one side and thirteen on the other side of a wall, which ran from end to end. Each palace contained an immense number of apartments. Twenty-seven was the number of the nomes of Egypt; and each nome had a palace appropriated to it. His description is accompanied by a drawing, made by Mr. Arundale, in accordance with his views. As to the object of this stupendous work, our author shall speak for himself. Vol. II. p. 338.

"The labyrinth has evidently the character of a national building, common to the whole of Egypt. In it the élite of every district assembled together; the most respectable members of the military and agricultural castes, with the priests and priestesses of the temples. There were the great festivals celebrated; there were the most important suits decided, and quarrels made up[2]. To such a building an historico-topographical exhibition is very well adapted. The labyrinth was thus in reality a civic, religious, and political sanctuary; a museum, in which the exploits of the kings and the history of each district were represented, and without doubt explained by hieroglyphical inscriptions. Each district found there presented to the eye the history of its princely families, and the monuments that they had erected: and consequently the leading features of both particular and general Egyptian traditions."

In reference to the statement of Herodotus respecting this

[2] It is to Tyrwhitt's happy emendation of the text of Strabo that we are indebted for the passage which our author here paraphrases. In former editions it was quite unintelligible.

labyrinth, Chevalier Bunsen considers it probable that twelve of the palaces may have been *repaired* by the twelve chiefs whom he represents as having built it. He thus, according to his notion of the duty of an historical critic, expressed in a passage that we have already quoted, endeavours to *recognize the portion of truth* which lurks in a statement that is proved to be in the main false. It seems to us far more likely that the whole story of the dodecarchy was a fable, improvized by the Egyptian cicerone of Herodotus; who was ignorant of the real history of the labyrinth, but who must needs say something about it, in order to satisfy the inquisitive Greek. Diodorus took the story from Herodotus, embellishing it by the addition of the number of years that the twelve kings ruled; but there is no trace of any such government, either in Manetho or on the monuments.

What appears among the most remarkable circumstances connected with the labyrinth is, that modern travellers should have so completely overlooked it. Dr. Lepsius said that "he could scarcely believe his eyes when he read the accounts of previous travellers. Where they saw formless hillocks and a few walls, he found at once several hundred chambers, some of them with roofs, corridors, and remains of columns." Belzoni, who, uneducated as he was, surpassed most persons in power of observation, is the only traveller who appears to have been impressed with the importance of these ruins [3]. He had no idea, however, that they were the remains of the labyrinth, which he vainly sought for on the shores of the Birket el Kerún.

From the mention of the labyrinth it is an easy transition to that of the lake of Mœris, on the shores of which others, as well as Belzoni, have supposed that it should be found. The subject of this lake is discussed at great length by Chevalier Bunsen, and we must say a few words respecting it. Till within the last few years two propositions were esteemed incontrovertible; one, that the lake now existing to the northwest of the Fayyúm was the lake of Mœris; the other, that it was asserted by ancient writers that this lake, receiving the waters of the Nile during the inundation, sent them back to the valley of the Nile during the dry season, so as to water its more elevated parts. It was shewn by Sir G. Wilkinson, and subsequently by Mr. Perring, that this was physically impossible; the level of the lake, the Birket el Kerún, being above a hundred feet below that of the Nile. Are then the statements of ancient writers in respect to this lake to be rejected as fabulous? Such was the general opinion, when in 1843 M. Linant, inspector-general of bridges and roads, under the Viceroy of Egypt, pub-

[3] Vol. ii. p. 149.

lished a memoir on the subject. He affirmed that the lake of Mœris, spoken of by ancient writers, was not the Birket el Kerún, but an artificial lake, formed on the most elevated part of the Fayyúm by enormous dams, of which he pointed out here and there existing remains. Chevalier Bunsen has now proposed a different theory. He denies the second of the above propositions, in place of the first; maintaining that the ancient writers did not mean to say that the lake of Mœris sent back its waters to the valley of the Nile, but only to the upper part of the Fayyúm. He brings forward several strong objections to M. Linant's theory; among others, he asserts that in tracing the dam which formed the northern boundary of the lake, Dr. Lepsius had found that it did not include the two pyramids, mentioned by Herodotus as supporting statues. The site of these pyramids seems unquestionable; as travellers in the sixteenth century mention that a portion of a granite colossus then stood on one of the pyramidal pedestals, of which the remains are now visible at Biahmoo. M. Linant will, of course, reply to these objections; and we shall then be better able to judge of their validity. The greatest difficulty, however, in the way of admitting his theory appears to be its physical impossibility. It would appear from Chevalier Bunsen's statements—we have not seen M. Linant's own work—that the highest ground in the Fayyúm was 90 feet above the level of the lake, while the Nile is said to be at least 130 feet above the same. If so, it must be 40 feet, at least, above the supposed lake of M. Linant; and surely this is inconsistent with the notion that the waters of the latter could flow to the former. As to the Chevalier's own theory, it appears to us that it cannot stand a moment. To convey the water from the Birket el Kerún, up an open canal, to water the high grounds 80 or 90 feet above it, is obviously impossible. If the Egyptians could have accomplished this, they might surely have carried it the remainder of the way into the valley of the Nile, where the gradients (to speak in railway phrase) would have been comparatively good. This is one of the cases in which *ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte.*

With respect to the description given by Herodotus, Chevalier Bunsen rightly distinguishes between what "the Father of History" *saw*, and what he *heard*. He supposes, and we think justly, that he went to the labyrinth, *and no further*. From the high ledge of rock, on which it is situated, he looked down on the Fayyúm, the present upper terrace of which was then under water. According to the Chevalier's theory, this visit must have been paid at the time of the inundation; according to M. Linant's, it might have been at any time. Herodotus *saw* the

colossal statues of Mœris and his queen, on pedestals, in the midst of the water; but all the rest of his statement he derived by hearsay from his guide, whom, the Chevalier says, *he misunderstood*, but who, it appears to us, *misinformed him*. There are three of his statements, which according to both theories are absolutely false, and which could not have been misunderstood; the guide must have stated what was not the fact. We allude to the statements, that the basin which contained the water was excavated; that the earth which was dug out of it was carried away down the Nile; and that the pedestals of the colossi were 400 cubits high, 200 above and 200 below the water. These statements are unquestionably false; but both Chevalier Bunsen and M. Linant contend for the truth of the rest of this witness's testimony. The former thinks that Herodotus misunderstood him, as if he spoke of the water before him; whereas he was speaking of the Birket el Kerún, of which he told the truth. This, however, is inconceivable. The pyramids supporting colossi were in the water which lay before Herodotus. The guide told him that *they* were in the lake of Mœris, and were the statues of him and his wife. No confusion of the two lakes could, therefore, have existed. Besides, the guide's story could not be true of the Birket el Kerún, as we have already shewn. That lake is in the lowest part of the basin of the Fayyúm; and however the water of the Nile may have been kept from descending to it by dams, it is clear that, when it once reached it, no sluice, or combination of sluices, could bring it back from it. According to M. Linant's view of the matter, Herodotus rightly understood his informant as speaking of the water which lay before him; and his statements respecting it, with the exception of the three above mentioned, were true. We will not offer a positive judgment on the subject; but certainly we incline to the opinion that the dams discovered by M. Linant, by whomsoever made, were of the same nature as those in other parts of Egypt, and had no other object than to keep up the waters of the inundation, so that the high lands might derive more benefit from it. The construction of these dams, by which the benefits of the inundation were extended to the upper part of the Fayyúm, which thence derived its name, (Copt. Phiom, *the sea*) was the work of Mœris, whoever he was; whether, as Dr. Lepsius supposes, the builder of the labyrinth, or an earlier king, as Chevalier Bunsen still thinks, or the Mœris of the eighteenth dynasty, as others have supposed. The water, at the end of the inundation, was drawn off by sluices, but we are disposed to regard the statement that it returned to the Nile as a falsehood told to Herodotus by his guide.

Herodotus is, however, not the only ancient author who

mentions this lake, and its supposed use; and although we agree with Chevalier Bunsen that most of the others merely copied from him, the testimony of Strabo, who visited this part of Egypt, must not be overlooked. It is very evident that in Strabo's time, the aspect of the Fayyúm was the same, or nearly the same, as it is at present. The lake, which he calls that of Mœris, was unquestionably the Birket el Kerún; and he describes it as a *natural* lake, accounting for its existence, as for that of other natural lakes, by the action of the sea in former times. He sailed, too, along the canal which now exists from Ptolemais, the modern Ilahún, past the labyrinth, to Medínet el Fayyúm. M. Linant would perhaps explain this by saying, that the real lake of Mœris had disappeared since the time of Herodotus; its dams having been allowed to perish, or having been destroyed by Ochus; and that the canal from the labyrinth to Arsinoe, had been constructed through its former bed. But is it certain that Strabo states *on his own authority* that the water flowed back from the lake of Mœris? May he not have drawn up his description of Egypt after he had left it, combining his personal observations with what he found stated by previous writers? and may not this statement have rested on the testimony of Herodotus? We have some doubts, whether our author gives the true meaning of Strabo, in respect to the double termination of the canal. He makes this to be on the west, at Arsinoe, and at the lake; but Strabo may have meant that the canal joined the Nile in two places, above and below the Heracleopolitan island.

We return to the pyramids. The first in point of workmanship, as well as the largest, are in the Gizeh group, and of these it has been supposed hitherto that the largest was the oldest. Chevalier Bunsen denies this. His arguments in favour of the contrary supposition are rather numerous than cogent. "It is natural," he says, "to suppose that the younger brother and surviving successor should have endeavoured to surpass his predecessor." Probably, however, it would be more natural to suppose that a king who came to the throne in his old age, or, at any rate, when far advanced in life, should have despaired of *equalling* his predecessor, who had commenced his pyramid when young, and had probably found it begun by his father. The construction of the larger pyramid is peculiar; and therefore it was, in the Chevalier's opinion, probably later. The principal peculiarity in its construction was, however, evidently occasioned by its being intended to receive the bodies of two kings; and if the superior antiquity of the second pyramid be contended for, on the ground of its more nearly resembling the *older* pyramids of Abouseer, we reply by denying that those pyramids are

older than the Gizeh pyramids. The Chevalier founds another argument on the manner in which Manetho mentions the building of the great pyramid. If he had agreed with Herodotus, he thinks he would have said, "Whom Herodotus called Cheops;" whereas he says, "Who built the great pyramid, which Herodotus says was built by Cheops." These words appear to the Chevalier to imply that Manetho considered Herodotus to have been mistaken, and that, therefore, it was the younger brother who built the great pyramid. There is no doubt that Manetho considered Herodotus to have been mistaken; but we cannot see the necessity of attributing to him any other mistake than that he referred to a late period, a little before the Ethiopian conquest, works which Manetho ascribed to the fourth dynasty. It appears to us that the position of the second pyramid furnishes a strong presumptive argument that it was the later of the two. The diagonals of the two pyramids are in one line; consequently, the position of the pyramid which was built last was regulated by that of the other, while the builder of the first was at liberty to choose for it the ground that he liked best. Now it is scarcely to be supposed that the builder of the second pyramid would have selected for it its actual site, had he been at full liberty. It stands on an irregular mass of rock, which had to be cut down, in some places to the depth of thirty feet, to form a level for it. On the other hand, if the great pyramid were first built on the level ground, that was best suited for such a work, we can easily conceive that his successor would choose the rocky ground to the south-west, rather than that in any other direction, in order that his pyramid, by being on a more elevated base, might not be overtopped by its larger neighbour.

These arguments, however, on both sides are merely presumptive ones; the Chevalier principally relies on the direct evidence furnished by the name of the builder of the great pyramid, which was found by Colonel Vyse in its interior. This name was found painted on the stones, as if it had been done by the quarrymen, not engraved, or forming a part of a regular inscription. Still, there can be no reasonable doubt that it is the name of the king who built the pyramid; and the question then arises, is it the name of Cheops or of Cephren? Chevalier Bunsen contends for the latter; but his mode of dealing with the name is a violation of all the established principles of etymology. The names of the earlier Egyptian kings, and the first names of the later ones, consisted in almost every instance of the name of the sun, Râ, or Phrâ (which Major Felix long since identified with the Pharaoh of the Scriptures), and a simple or compound epithet

or qualification. The name of the king in question, who was probably the very earliest king of whom we have any cotemporary monument, differed from these, in that it consisted of the name of another God, Nu, Nemu, or Nev (for the latter part of the name is uncertain), with a qualification. It was Nev-Khuv, or Khuv-Nev, *i. e.*, "Nev, the director." In the majority of instances, where the name occurs on the stones, it is thus written in full; but *once* it is written simply Nev, and *once* simply Khuv[4].

Where the king is referred to in monuments of a later age, the name of the god is, we believe, in *all* instances omitted. So it is in a tomb at Benihassan, of the age of the twelfth dynasty, and on a gold seal, in the possession of a gentleman at Cairo, of the age of the twenty-sixth dynasty; both of which mention a town, or district, in Egypt, which was called after this king. It is in this form, therefore, that we should expect to meet the name in Herodotus; and accordingly, he gives Χεοψ, which is as good a representation of Khuv as we could expect to meet in Greek. The final sibilant is, as in all similar cases, an addition. It is uncertain whether the true reading of Diodorus be Χεμμις or Χεμβης. In either case, the initial letter is correct; and the Egyptian labial, to which the Greeks had no equivalent, is expressed by labials. Manetho gives Σουφις, pronounced Shoofis; which, again, is intended for the same name Khuv; the Kh of the early Egyptians being in course of time softened down into Sh, as in a host of other instances. We will now describe the process, by which Chevalier Bunsen converts this name into Kephren. He takes for the name of the king Nev, in which form, as we have seen, it once occurs; and, observing that Egyptian royal names *in general* included the name of the Sun, he adds that name here, so as to form Nev-re; thus combining the names of *two gods*, in a manner which is without a parallel. *Genuine* Egyptian names of kings consist of one name of a god, and one epithet or qualification. Nevre, however, is not Kephre; and the letters N and K have never hitherto been considered so near akin, as that one of them could pass into the other. Many persons would have been checked by this difficulty; but it is easily surmounted by that etymological skill, or hardihood, which

[4] The name is sometimes *apparently* written Khuvu, the *name of the last letter*, vu, being substituted for the *letter itself*. Of this fundamental principle in Egyptian writing, it appears from Chevalier Bunsen's section on that subject, and from the very defective and erroneous alphabet which he has consequently given, that he is completely ignorant. The hieroglyphical name of the river Euphrates, which consists of eight signs, would, according to *his* system, be read in four syllables, Pu-ha-ru-ta (!), instead of in *one*, PHRaT, as in Hebrew. The Egyptians, having no F in their language, expressed its sound by PH. What the Chevalier imagines to be an F was really an English V, or a German W.

discovered in Pemphos a corruption of Smenteti! "The Greeks and Romans in their transcriptions of Egyptian words were in the habit of prefixing a guttural to N. Nephre would thus become Knephre; *and this might be contracted into Kephre.*" In other words N might be converted into K. But experience shows that Kn is *not* contracted into K. The combination occurs at the commencement of many English and German words; and we are pretty sure that the Chevalier cannot name one, in either language, in which the sound of the N has been dropped. In order to expose completely the tissue of mistakes which Chevalier Bunsen has made on this subject, we have only to show who the king was that Herodotus calls Kephren. This is easily done. It is the king whom the Chevalier calls Schafra. His name is properly Kâv-râ (or Khâv-râ, the power of the initial letter being not quite certain) that is "Ra (or Pharaoh) the ruler," a name very similar to that of his brother. Accordingly Manetho gives the name of Suphis to both of them, which represents only the verbal noun, or participle, that was one element in the name; while Herodotus and Diodorus call the second brother Kephren and Chabryes, taking into account the divine name Ra[5], which he bore, and which his brother did not bear. This Kâv-râ or Schafra has a title on cotemporary monuments, which the Chevalier rightly translates "der Grosse der Pyramide," "the Lord of the Pyramid;" but he appears to reason on it, as if it signified "of the great pyramid." According to his view of the matter, this king completed the great pyramid, which the king whose name is found in it had begun; for he shows that it is highly probable, if not certain, that this pyramid was not the work of one king, but was intended to contain the bodies of two. We should rather think that Cheops, whose name is found in it, was the king who completed it; and that it was begun by some unknown predecessor, probably his father. According to the original plan of the pyramid, the underground chamber, to which the first entrance passage directly leads, was the tomb of the builder. The two upper chambers were, according to Chevalier Bunsen, originally designed to be parlours, such as every pyramid contained, in addition to the chamber where the body was deposited, and where a funeral feast was probably laid out. To take this view of them he was in a manner constrained by his hypothesis of the name found in the upper chambers being that of the first builder of the pyramid. We, who think that it was that of the king who com-

[5] The second letter in the name of this god has the power of the Hebrew ע; hence the occasional, but only occasional, presence of the N.

pleted it, are relieved from the improbabilities connected with this hypothesis. We suppose that the original builder merely commenced the work, and that the upward passage and the apartments to which it leads were designed by the king who completed it. It is not unlikely, too, that he increased the dimensions of the pyramid, so that each side should contain eight times that Egyptian measure of length, which the Greeks translated πλέθρον, as being nearly equivalent to their own measure so named.

Mr. Perring has contributed to Chevalier Bunsen's work an appendix "on the original measures of the pyramids;" in which he endeavours to assign the number of cubits which each linear element of each pyramid was originally intended to contain. The idea is a good one, but a fundamental error has vitiated all the operations. Mr. Perring has assumed that the Egyptian measure above mentioned contained 56 cubits instead of 55; he has consequently made the side of the great pyramid 448 in place of 440 cubits; thus making the cubit about a quarter of an inch less than the truth. The incorrectness of this estimate appears from two wholly independent considerations.

In no Egyptian measurements which we possess is the number 56 or its multiples connected with the cubit; but 55 and its multiples are so repeatedly. Thus, in the Anastasi papyrus No. I. col. xiv., a building is mentioned, which was 330 cubits in length by 55 in breadth; and in the following column, an obelisk is mentioned of the height of 110 cubits. Mr. Perring was, doubtless, unaware of this fact; but we are surprised at his overlooking the argument which we are about to notice. He himself has pointed out the remarkable relation which exists between the side of the base and the height. The half-side is to the perpendicular height, as the slant height to the whole side; or, at least, this proportion holds good as nearly as it is possible that it should do. Now the lowest integral numbers which satisfy this condition are 40, 25, and 32. They are in the required proportion; and the half of 40 forms with the other two numbers a triangle which is *very nearly* right-angled. Its angle is in point of fact 89°56′33.5″, which the Egyptians could not have distinguished from a right angle. Of these integral numbers the numbers of cubits contained in the side of the base, the interior and the slant height of the pyramid must have been *multiples*. The Egyptians, with their scanty knowledge of mathematics, could not have applied this proportion to the fractional numbers which Mr. Perring's hypothesis assumes; but, if we take 440 cubits for the length of the side, we have 275 for the altitude, and 352 for the slant height; all integral numbers and

all multiples of the "khe," *tree* or *rod*, which contained eleven cubits[6]. The true length of the cubit was then about 1.736 foot, in place of 1.713, as assumed by Mr. Perring. This agrees with the length obtained by supposing the height of the floor of the king's chamber in the great pyramid, (138.75 feet), to be eighty cubits; and it agrees pretty well with the length of the cubit at the ancient Nilometer at Elephantine, which is still preserved. This gives 1.729 foot. The Babylonish cubit, too, which was, doubtless, the same as the Egyptian, was, according to Böckh, 1.737 foot. It is very true that *some* of the ancient Egyptian cubits preserved in museums are shorter than this; but why may we not suppose that they were made so intentionally, with a fraudulent object?

The third of the Gizeh pyramids is ascribed by Herodotus and Diodorus to a king Mycerinus, or Mencherinus; but the former mentions a report that it was built by a female named Rhodopis. By Manetho it is assigned to a queen Nitocris, who, according to him, was the last sovereign of the sixth dynasty. Herodotus mentions her, and relates her unfortunate end, but says nothing of her pyramid. Chevalier Bunsen has reconciled these apparently inconsistent statements, pointing out the portion of truth which is contained in each. The history of this pyramid, is, indeed, a most extraordinary one. The work of two sovereigns, it was twice rifled, at remote epochs, before its mysterious recesses were penetrated by Col. Vyse. Mr. Perring furnished the data, by which the secret of the pyramid was rendered discoverable; but it was the Chevalier who made the discovery. As this pyramid, though the most interesting of all, is the least known, many of our readers being probably still ignorant of the fact that it has been opened; we will give a full account of it from the work of Chevalier Bunsen, vol. ii. p. 166, &c.

"This is called by the ancients, 'the most costly and magnificent of all the pyramids;' and such it still appears to be, even in its ruins. Its coating was of granite up to a considerable height; and its interior exceeded even the first pyramid in beauty and regularity of structure. Its magnitude was, indeed, much less. It did not cover quite three English acres. The base of each of its faces measured only $345\frac{1}{2}$ feet[7]; its altitude was only 218 feet (it is still 203) and its slant

[6] The correspondence of this with the English pole of $5\frac{1}{2}$ yards, commonly computed as 11 cubits, is very curious. Mr. Perring disguises the necessarily fractional character of one of his numbers, by throwing the derangement, produced by the deviation of the above angle from a right-angle, on the slant height. He gives the numbers as 8, 5, and 6.40312; but his own measurements show that he should have taken 8, 4.9960 and 6.4; the ratio of the base to the slant height being *accurately* that of 40 to 32, or 5 to 4.

[7] The text of our author says $354\frac{1}{2}$, and so Mr. Perring seems to have estimated

height was 278 feet 2 inches, now 261 feet 4 inches. But in the boldness and massiveness of its foundation it surpassed all the pyramids, no less than in beauty. In order to obtain a level surface for it to stand on, instead of taking away the rock, which rose more than ten feet at the west above what it did at the east, two courses of enormous blocks were built under the lower side, which is particularly depressed at the north-east. At that angle, this underwork extends considerably beyond the base of the pyramid, so as to supply the place of the pavement which encircles the pyramid, and which was, doubtless, originally coated with finer materials. There is this peculiarity also in the plan of this pyramid. It was originally built in several steps, rising perpendicularly, and decreasing towards the top ; the form of a pyramid being given to this kernel by filling up the void spaces between the steps."

After mentioning the different accounts, which ancient authors have given of its building, he proceeds :—

"The solution of the enigma lies, we believe, in a circumstance, which the fidelity of the discoverers of the interior has reported to us; though it could not have had the great value in their eyes, which it has acquired for us. . . . Thirteen feet above the base, a passage which descends at an angle of 26°2′, of the usual breadth and height, and 104 feet long, now leads into the interior of the pyramid. The granite coating ceases on the rock being entered 28 feet 2 inches down. From the termination of this passage a horizontal one, slightly inclined towards the end, leads to a great chamber. On the way to this, it passes through an antechamber, 12 feet long, 10 feet 5 inches broad, and 7 feet high. Its walls are coated with white stucco, which divides them lengthwise into narrow stripes. Through the whole length of this chamber, the road was blocked up with great stones, which kept both the doors closed. This obstacle being surmounted, three granite portcullises, at short distances from each other, check the progress of the intruder. These defensive arrangements announce that a sanctuary is near. The chamber itself is actually a tomb, 46 feet 3 inches long from east to west, 12 feet 7 inches broad, and originally 12 feet high. The bottom was covered with a pavement, which has been torn away, so that the uneven surface of the rock is now exposed. In this destroyed pavement and in the rock a sarcophagus was fastened, the dimensions of which corresponded to those of the sarcophagus in the great pyramid. Mr. Perring found in the chamber several pieces of red granite, which he recognized as the remains of the sarcophagus; —no doubt the fragments which remained after its destruction. We must necessarily assume that this destruction was the work of the Egyptians themselves, in order that we may account for the total disap-

it. A calculation from the altitude and the slant height shows, however, that the two last figures have been transposed. Here again we have 200, 125, and 160 cubits for the three dimensions, not 206, 128, and 165.56, as Mr. Perring makes them.

pearance of the sarcophagus. The plunderers of the pyramid would perhaps have broken the sarcophagus; but they would not have been at the pains to break the hard mass into small pieces, so that it could be carried away through the entrance. This would have given considerable trouble, which for them would have been quite useless.

"The plan, however, does not end here. Seventeen feet from the east end there appears in the pavement the mouth of a descending passage. This extends at an angle more than 33 feet; and then proceeds horizontally 10 feet further, to the tomb of Mycerinus. Along this way, also, every thing was done to prevent an entrance, and to render the carrying away of the sarcophagus impossible. The descending passage is 4 feet 9 inches high, and the same in width; but for half its height it is confined by projecting banks on both sides, so as to be scarcely three feet across; and this space is again stopped up by blocks fixed in the wall for 16 feet 9 inches in length. Lastly, just before the horizontal part is reached, a granite portcullis stops the way. . . . The tomb itself is coated with blocks of granite, two feet and a half thick. Artificially formed iron cramps seem to have connected these together, and fastened them to the rock. Two of them were found, and are preserved in the British Museum. This tomb is not so spacious as the upper one. Its length from north to south is 21 feet 8 inches, and its breadth 8 feet 7 inches. Blocks of ten feet and a half long, bent together, form the roof; their under surface is cut away, so as to form an arch. The height at the gable is 11 feet 3 inches. . . . In this tomb Col. Vyse found the sarcophagus of Mycerinus, the Holy. . . . This venerable work was unfortunately lost on its way to England, on the coast of Spain. It was of a dark brown basalt, blue in the fracture, very beautifully wrought. The stone was evidently first sawed, and then carefully polished. The exterior was very elegant, architecturally divided, somewhat in the Doric style."

The cover, in fragments, was found under about three feet of the rubbish in the great chamber, and near it pieces of a coffin with the remains of Mycerinus.

The latter have fortunately escaped the fate of the sarcophagus, and are now in the British Museum. The body is not wrapped in byssus, as in later times, but in coarse woollen cloth. Some have questioned the genuineness of the body from this circumstance; but the inscription on the cover of the coffin should remove all doubt. It is in two vertical columns, and has been thus translated by Mr. Birch:—"Osirian (blessed) King Men-ke-u-ra, of eternal life, engendered of the heaven, child of Netpe (Rhea), offspring of the mother (of the Gods) [beloved by Seb (Saturn)]. May thy mother Netpe (the Neith of heaven) extend herself over thee by her name of Spreader of the heaven! . . . . presenting to thee the God, destroyer of thy impure enemies, O King Men-ke-u-ra, the everliving." The middle of both columns

is wanting, and part of the above is translated from a text supplied by the conjecture of Dr. Lepsius. Of the meaning of the greater part, however, there can be no question.

"Here, then (our author proceeds), we have come from the entrance into the undoubted tomb, and have reached the resting-place of Mycerinus. *But is it by the way that Mycerinus reached it?* All the passages through which we have wandered (as far as the great chamber) are, as Mr. Perring's sharp eye observed, chiselled from within outwards. How, then, did Mycerinus come into the pyramid? Originally, it is certain, by the *upper passage.* At the top of the so called great chamber, that is, the upper tomb, a horizontal passage terminates; and this is joined to one which descends at the same angle at the entrance. It terminates at the beginning of the rock. If it were to extend further, to the original face of the (present) pyramid, its lower part would terminate about thirty-three feet above the ground line, or twenty feet above the under, now the only, entrance. *Now this upper entrance is chiselled from without inwards,* as the under one is, on the contrary, wrought outwards, by a person who was already in the pyramid. This may be accounted for in two ways, Mycerinus either built the pyramid, as we now see it, or a smaller one, of which the present upper passage was the entrance. On this supposition, it terminated about as much above the ground line as the present entrance does above that of the present pyramid. In the other case, the stopping up with masonry of the entrance, which had been opened through the rock, can only be accounted for by supposing that the original plan was abandoned, with a view to build a larger pyramid. It is thus that Mr. Perring explains it. Such a change of purpose, however, in respect of the most skilfully constructed of all the pyramids is certainly very improbable. Now Manetho says expressly, 'Nitocris built the third pyramid.' Diodorus ascribes its building to Mycerinus, but he adds that 'he did not complete it.' Herodotus and Strabo also had heard of the building of the third pyramid by this celebrated queen."

The Chevalier argues that Nitocris was the Rhodopis of these writers. This name signifies "the rosy-cheeked;" and in the Armenian version of Eusebius, the remark of Manetho respecting Nitocris is thus rendered; "she was the most beautiful of women, yellow, with rosy cheeks." The conclusion then at which he arrives is this, Mycerinus built a small pyramid in the heart of the present third pyramid. Its dimensions are said to be about 180 feet along the base, and 145 in altitude; but it strikes us that these cannot be stated with any confidence, from the uncertainty that must exist as to what was the horizontal line of the original pyramid, and how high above it the entrance was. The two chambers in this pyramid were intended, the one for his tomb, the other for the parlour, or anteroom, that generally

accompanied it. Some generations after his death, Nitocris enlarged the pyramid, taking the outer chamber of Mycerinus for her tomb. Whether she was buried in it or not is uncertain. If she was, the Egyptians, to whom she had given mortal offence, violated her tomb and carried off her coffin; if she was not buried there, they wreaked their vengeance on the empty sarcophagus that had been intended for her; but they spared the tomb of the holy Mycerinus. Long after this, about 1240 A.D., the pyramid was opened again, avarice being now the inducement in place of enmity. Edrisi, cited by Col. Vyse (ii. 71, note) states that, shortly before he wrote, a company of adventurers undertook the opening of the pyramid.

"After they had laboured in the pyramid for six months with pick-axes in great numbers, hoping for treasures, they at last discovered a long blue vessel. After they had broken off its cover, they found nothing but a body, beside which lay some gold plates, on which were inscribed unknown characters. From the proceeds of these, each man received a hundred dinars."

With respect to the destruction of the pyramids in general, Chevalier Bunsen says (p. 149.):

"The history of the destruction of these wonderful works shows that curiosity and a thirst for hidden treasures induced the old khalifs to open an entrance into them; the first of these was probably Mammún, the son of Harún Al Raschíd. Afterwards, under Saladin, the pyramids, and especially their coatings, were regularly used as quarries. The wantonness and destructive propensity of the Mamelukes completed the work of destruction."

We now come to consider the time at which the pyramids were built. Chevalier Bunsen seems to have no more doubt of the dates of the accession of these sovereigns, whose tombs they were, than of those of the Emperors of Germany, or the Kings of France. Mycerinus, according to him, began to reign in 3173, B.C.; and reigned for thirty-one years. Nitocris reigned six years, commencing in 2973 B.C. And so with the other kings of the Old Kingdom; Menes, the first of them, beginning to reign in 3643 B.C. Our readers will naturally wish to know the grounds on which he assigns these dates, so strangely at variance with the received chronology. The Chevalier informs us very candidly (vol. ii. p. 3,) that his chronological system is independent of the discoveries recently made. It stands or falls with the philologico-historical investigation from which he deduced it. It is founded on the fragments of Manetho, and on the catalogue of Theban kings attributed to Eratosthenes. Our

readers do not need to be told that these sources of information have been long open to the learned. They have been carefully studied by a great number of individuals; many of them, we will venture to say, quite as capable of forming a right judgment of them as the Chevalier Bunsen; and, we will add, some of them quite as free as he is from that *belief in the veracity of Moses*, by which he complains that his predecessors have been fettered. Several of these have published their respective theories as to the mode in which statements that appear at first sight very discordant might be reconciled. Others, perhaps the ablest, have, after a full investigation, abandoned the attempt to reconcile them; being convinced that the truth could never be elicited from statements so corrupted as these appear to be.

The genuineness of the catalogue of Eratosthenes is exceedingly doubtful. If genuine, there is no doubt that it has been corrupted to an enormous extent. Chevalier Bunsen admits that the names of the kings have been in many cases completely altered. We have given one instance, already, of his restoration of the original text from the corrupted MS. One other such will probably suffice to satisfy the curiosity of our readers. Where the MSS. read Στοῖχος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν Ἄρης ἀναίσθητος, he affirms that Eratosthenes wrote Τοιχαρῆς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν Ἡλιόθετος. He admits, again, that the interpretations of the names are not to be depended on. He thinks that many of them have been corrupted from what Eratosthenes gave, and that many others were in the first instance erroneous, the informants of Eratosthenes having given him fictitious derivations, somewhat in the style of Dean Swift's. Yet, while he thus admits that both the names and their interpretations are proper subjects for the boldest *inner criticism*, strange to say, he claims exemption from it for the numbers of years which the thirty-eight kings are said to have reigned. Hitherto the numbers found in MSS. have been considered peculiarly liable to be erroneous; but the Chevalier will not allow those in the pretended list of Eratosthenes to be disputed! Now, though it may perhaps be admitted that the numbers given by the Chevalier are the same which Syncellus wrote in the eighth or ninth century, we should like to know how it can be proved, or shown to be at all probable, that they were those which Eratosthenes wrote a thousand years before him. If the catalogue were genuine, we think it would be entitled to very little credit, from the corruption which it must almost necessarily have undergone; we regard it, however, as a contemptible forgery.

The fragments of Manetho possess much higher claims to authenticity; and if they had reached us in their original form,

they would be of great assistance to us in restoring the old Egyptian chronology; so far back, at least, as the seventeenth or eighteenth century before Christ. In their present state, however, we cannot think them to be of much value. We entertain no doubt that Manetho copied from Egyptian sources of considerable antiquity. From comparing the best preserved portion of his work, the account of the eighteenth dynasty, as given by Josephus, with the list of the twelfth dynasty, as restored by Dr. Lepsius from the fragments of the Turin papyrus, we cannot doubt that he made use of an Egyptian manuscript, similar to that of which the fragments are now in the Turin museum. The date of this manuscript corresponds with the close of his second volume. Probably, therefore, he extracted from this work the contents of his two first volumes, while he collected those of the third from various later authorities. But, admitting this, we seek in vain for any proofs that the Egyptians had any authentic dates, in the eleventh or the twelfth century before Christ, by which they could determine the succession of their kings for more than a few centuries back. Dynasties of fabulous kings might have been invented *then*, just as well as at a later period. Among their names those of the more ancient kings that were preserved by tradition might be introduced; and, to give greater plausibility to the imposture, the number of years, months and days that each king reigned may have been set down. We ask for proof that the earlier dynasties of Manetho were, in their original state, any better than what we have described. Chevalier Bunsen tells us that "the oldest writings of the Egyptians were contained in their holy books; and that these contained an historical element derived from the old kingdom;" whence he infers that registries of ancient kings made by their contemporaries must have existed from this remote period. When, however, we come to the proof of these statements, we are referred to a passage in the Todtenbuch, in which the name of Menkare, the builder of the third pyramid is mentioned; and when we examine this passage, we find that it is not in the Todtenbuch itself, but in an *annotation*, in the Turin MS.—found, we believe, in no other copy; in which, after some directions have been given as to the use to be made of a certain chapter, it is promised, that, if those directions be complied with, the deceased person shall share the blessedness of this celebrated king. The age of the Turin MS. is in dispute. Dr. Lepsius assigns it to the thirteenth, fourteenth, or fifteenth century before Christ; others maintain that it is not older than the first or second; but, assuming the earlier date to be the true one, we still deny the *historical* character of the passage; we

should consider it to be no evidence even of the existence of the king named.

Beyond the last twelve or thirteen centuries of the Egyptian monarchy,—or, at any rate beyond the period to which dated monuments can be proved to extend, we consider the statements of Manetho, even if we had them in their original form, to be of but little moment; and even within that limit we could not regard them as conclusive evidence for the true chronology. It appears probable—and Chevalier Bunsen has admitted it to be the case (vol. ii. p. 3, &c.)—that Manetho himself represented cotemporary dynasties as successive; and, what is still more likely to lead astray, because it is less easy to be detected, that in cases of disputed successions and divided sovereignties, he represented each of the claimants of the crown as reigning alone for the whole time that he reigned at all. If Manetho did not commit this error himself, his editors or copyists certainly did. Nor was this the only fault committed by them. It is beyond a doubt that they falsified his numbers to make them accord with their several chronological systems. Mr. Browne has shewn this very clearly in the appendix to his "Ordo Sæclorum." It has been done by them to such an extent, that the true reading of Manetho can in very few places be relied on; and, when this consideration is combined with the former ones, a restoration of the chronology from his fragments appears to us the most hopeless of all tasks.

Our readers will have no difficulty, from what we have already said, to discover the position which we mean to take in opposition to Chevalier Bunsen. We do not propose to set up any other chronology of the old dynasties as a rival to his; but we contend that there is no chronology to be had for these dynasties. There is no evidence that the Egyptians in those times referred their years to any era; and if they did not, the Egyptians in subsequent times could not so refer them on any sure grounds. Before the twelfth dynasty we have very few *dated* monuments; and none of those that we have is much earlier than the first Amenemhe[8]. To determine the dates before his accession from the monuments is, therefore, impossible; and we really

[8] We are glad to see that Chevalier Bunsen has not adopted the truly ridiculous theory of the French writers, Messrs. Letronne, L'Hôte, and Prisse, respecting the sun-worshippers of Tel Amara, and the king whose tomb is in the western valley at Thebes. These "immediate successors of the gods" have been placed by the Chevalier in their proper position, after Amenotp III., in the eighteenth dynasty. He imagines, however, that Vach-en-Aten, the sun-worshipper, was the *widow* of Amenotp IV., instead of that king himself, when he had fanatically changed his name. He is represented with that name, attended by his queen and children, in various sculptures, copied by M. L'Hôte and others.

cannot think that any other means of determining them can be relied on.

There is an argument, however, which Chevalier Bunsen adduces, which we feel ourselves called on to notice. He lays much stress upon it; but, so far from its being of service to him, it recoils fearfully against him:—

"If," he says, (vol. ii. p. 17,) "from any period monuments are preserved with historical names and facts, and if a chronology is offered to us, which not only professes to be drawn from cotemporary monuments, or to be taken from records, which are founded on such; *but which also actually agrees with the monuments that are preserved to us*, the full weight of historical assurance must attach itself to such a chronology."

He repeats in different places his positive statement that, where the monuments can be used as a test of his system, *they agree with it*. So in his preface to the second volume, (p. iii.) "So none of the names of kings on cotemporary monuments, and none of their numbers of years, is at variance with the Eratosthenic list; *they all confirm it*, and thereby also Manetho;" for he had previously stated his conviction, that he had reconciled the apparently contradictory statements of Manetho and Eratosthenes.

Now, there is one period in our author's old kingdom, in which the truth of this boast, that his system is confirmed by the monuments, may be tested. We allude to the twelfth dynasty, in which a monumental chronology is clearly traceable. We must do him the justice to say, that he himself acknowledges this. After stating his mode of reducing Eratosthenes and Manetho to harmony in what they say of this dynasty;—or, we should rather say, in what the latter says of it, and the former is supposed to say of it; he proceeds (p. 279):—

"THE TWELFTH DYNASTY IS THEN THE TOUCHSTONE AND KEYSTONE[9] OF OUR ENTIRE CHRONOLOGICAL SYSTEM FOR THE OLD KINGDOM.—If the chronological assumptions respecting this dynasty just announced be correct, then is the immediate and constraining proof of our fundamental principle, which alone was yet wanting, supplied; and we possess a chronology of the old kingdom, which is a matter of fact, proved by records of three thousand years' duration, and confirmed by cotemporary monuments much older still; a chronology, such as in the Grecian and Roman history we first attain a long time after the Olympiads and the Building of the City. BUT IF OUR CHRONOLOGICAL

[9] "Der Prüf- und Schlusz-Stein." Is not this a strange confusion of metaphors?

STATEMENT RESPECTING THE TWELFTH DYNASTY BE INCORRECT, WE POSSESS NO CHRONOLOGY AT ALL. For the monuments do not naturally give any reckoning of time; although, in this dynasty especially, they mention isolated regnal years. The two old tables of kings contain just as little chronological information. . . . And, lastly, the papyrus itself, even if it must be supposed to state the actual length of this dynasty, fails us for all the other dynasties of the old kingdom, and consequently only proves the hopeless situation of Egyptian chronology."

This is just what we before endeavoured to show. The recovery of Egyptian chronology, except by slow degrees, and with intervals of unknown length between the reigns that are known, is HOPELESS. Chevalier Bunsen ought in candour to acknowledge this; for we will now prove that his last alternative is the fact. His chronological statement respecting the twelfth dynasty *is incorrect;* it is irreconcilable with cotemporary monuments, to which we will refer him.

A very brief view of the Chevalier's arrangement of the twelfth dynasty will suffice; but, before we proceed to give it, we must make some preliminary remarks. It appears from cotemporary monuments that this dynasty included eight sovereigns, the first, third, sixth, and seventh of whom bore the name of Amenemhe, and the second, fourth, and fifth that of Osortasen[1]. The name of the last has not been yet ascertained, but according to Manetho, as reported by Africanus, it was that of a queen; and Dr. Lepsius, who found the prænomen at the labyrinth, calls her a queen in one of his published letters; Chevalier Bunsen, however, maintains that this sovereign was a king. The number of reigns mentioned in the Turin book of kings, the fragments of which containing this dynasty have been for the most part recovered, is also eight; and the number of years that they reigned in all is said to be 213, with an overplus of one month and 17 days. We give this list along with the corresponding list of Africanus, in order to show how little dependence can be placed on that writer's representation of Manetho; for there is no reasonable ground for doubting that the latter agreed with the papyrus. Eusebius differs from Africanus, in that he omits the last three reigns, giving their sum as 42 years, which would give 198 years for the whole. He, however, *states* the sum to be 245 years.

[1] Chevalier Bunsen writes this name Sesortasen. We have no doubt, however, that the first letter had the power of the Hebrew ע, as in עז, עור, to both which roots the Egyptian verb, which is the first element in this name, has relations. As a noun, this word signifies *an oar* [Copt. ⲟⲩⲥⲟⲥϩ]; and is also the name of a town to the north-east of Egypt, probably Gaza, עזה. To derive either of these from Sesor appears to us impossible.

Monumental Names.	Reigned according to the Papyrus. Y.	M.	D.	Africanus's Names.	Reigned.
Amenemhe I.	19	..	..	Ammanemes	16
Osortasen I.	45	..	..	Gesongosis.....	46
Amenemhe II.	3.	..	..	Ammanemes	38
Osortasen II.	19	..	..	Sesostris	48
Osortasen III.	3.	..	..	Lachares	8
Amenemhe III.	4.	..	..	Ameres	8
Amenemhe IV.	9	3	27	Amenemes	8
Queen unnamed	3	10	4	Queen Scemiophris ...	4
Total	213	1	17		176

The three units wanting in the years, and the six deficient numbers of months and days must have amounted to sixteen years, eleven months, sixteen days. We will add, that it appears probable, from one of the Sallier papyri in the British Museum, that Osortasen I. was not the son of Amenemhe I.; he, in the first instance reduced him to insignificance, but allowed him to retain the royal title, probably marrying his daughter; and in the end he seems to have deposed, and perhaps murdered him. A confusion in the reigns of these two monarchs is therefore to be expected, such as we meet in a later period in the case of Wavra and Amos, the Saites; but we cannot reasonably infer from this that similar confusion prevailed through all the reigns in the dynasty.

According to Chevalier Bunsen the true duration of this dynasty was only 147 years. He makes these eight reigns to correspond with four in the list of Eratosthenes, namely, the thirty-second and three following, which, according to his restoration of the text, stand thus:—

Ammenemes	26 years
Sesortosis and Ammenemes II.	23 do.
Sesortosis Hermes	55 do.
Mares	43 do.

In order to reconcile this statement with that of the papyrus, and with the two statements, as he appears to consider them, of Manetho, adopted by Africanus and Eusebius respectively, he has devised the following arrangement of these 147 years:—

Amenemhe I. reigned alone.....	4
Amenemhe I. and Sesortasen I.	3
Ditto under another arrangement.....	16
Ditto under another arrangement.....	3
Sesortasen I. alone	20
Sesortasen I. and Amenemhe II.	3

According to one Statement, or in one part of Egypt.		According to another Statement, or in the other part of Egypt.	
Sesortasen II. & Amenemhe II.	35	Sesortasen II. & Amenemhe II.	19
Sesortasen II. alone including a few years with Sesortasen III.	12	Amenemhe II. alone	1
Ameres	8	Amenemhe II. & Sesortasen III.	15
		Sesortasen III. alone	20
Amenemhe III. alone	30		
Amenemhe III. and Amenemhe IV.	9		
Amenemhe III. and Sebeknefru	4		

The Chevalier says that both the author of the Turin papyrus and Manetho were ignorant of this key, but that Eratosthenes was in possession of it; and that, consequently, he alone gives the true duration of the dynasty; the others counting particular intervals twice over, or even oftener. There is one interval, indeed, the reign of Amenemhe IV., which Manetho, according to the statement followed by Eusebius, counts no less than five times! Now our objection to this system is not its intrinsic improbability; though on that ground we think, that if it were worth while, a strong case could be made against it: we take a different ground of opposition. We say that this system *palpably contradicts the monuments*, which, to take a single instance, represent the reign of Osortasen II. as subsequent to that of Amenemhe II., whereas Chevalier Bunsen makes the two reigns nearly to coincide. There are two monuments, the evidence of which as to this point is decisive against the Chevalier. To one of these he refers himself (vol. ii. p. 310), a sculpture in the tomb of Nevotp at Benihassan, in which 37 strangers (or $\frac{1}{37}$ of the strangers) are represented as being brought before Nevotp with great solemnity, as a present from his lord, *in the sixth year of Sesortasen II.* Our readers will mark this date, and will observe that, according to the Chevalier's system, it corresponds with the 55th year of the dynasty, or the *ninth* year of Amenemhe II. Now in another part of this tomb (Burton's *Excerpta Hieroglyphica*, Pl. xxxiii.), it is stated that this Nevotp, having been educated by king Amenemhe II. was promoted by him to the rank of chief, and *sent to govern this district in the nineteenth year of his reign.* Thus, according to the Chevalier, he received a present as chief of a district ten years before he was sent to govern it!

But the Chevalier says, "There is a sarcophagus in Florence, which mentions Sesortasen II. and Amenemhe II. as reigning together." We admit it, but it only proves that they reigned together for a year or two, when the latter, being old, took the former into partnership with him; just as *his* father, Osortasen I.

had done with *him*. A stele at Leyden mentions the forty-fourth year of Osortasen I., as synchronizing with the second of Amenemhe II.; and a similar monument exists, showing what years of Amenemhe II. and Osortasen II. *really* synchronized; and thus, in the most satisfactory manner, showing the falsity of the Chevalier's synchronisms. In the sixty-first plate of the "Hieroglyphics," published by the Royal Society of Literature, we have an inscription, copied from the rocks between Assouan and Philæ, which bears date in the *thirty-fifth year of Amenemhe II., being the* THIRD *year of Osortasen II.;* and not the THIRTY-SECOND, as the Chevalier pretends. He is thus convicted on the clearest testimony of having subtracted twenty-nine years from the length of this dynasty, in the course of a single reign[2]! The chronological scheme of the dynasty which he has elaborated from Eratosthenes, or the Pseudo-Eratosthenes, is thus *proved to be erroneous;* and with it, *by his own admission*, "the entire of his chronology of the *Old Kingdom*" is demolished, and,

> ——— like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leaves not a wreck behind.

With respect to the *Middle Kingdom*, we do not feel ourselves called on to say more than a very few words. The question to be decided here is not whether the Middle Kingdom had or had not a *chronology*, but whether it had or had not an *existence*. The Champollions, Rosellini, and the English Egyptologists without exception suppose the king whose shield occupies the sixth place in the tablet of Abydos, to be the immediate successor of the king whose shield preceded his, or to be only separated from them by a female reign. Chevalier Bunsen affirms that between these two kings 1016 years are to be interposed, which he calls the Middle Kingdom. All that he has yet offered in support of this strange assertion, appears to us frivolous in the extreme. The only evidence on which we could

[2] Another palpable inconsistency between his scheme and the monuments, respects the second and third Osortasens. The former of these is, according to him, the Sesostris of Manetho, a great conqueror, who overran Europe and Asia, and reigned fifty-five years; whereas the latter was an obscure prince, whose name was omitted from the list of kings of Karnac, on account of his insignificance. The monuments on the contrary know nothing of the conquests of Osortasen II., whose reign appears to have been a short and inglorious one; whereas it is Osortasen III. who appears from them to be the hero of this dynasty. To him, as to a god, the temple of Samne, in Nubia, was dedicated by Thothmos III.; that very king who, according to the Chevalier, considered him unworthy of a place among those of his ancestors, or rather predecessors at Karnac. To us it appears quite evident, that this last is the king whose figure, with the name defaced, follows that of Amenemhe II. at Karnac, and who appears as Sesostris in the list of Manetho. This identification of him is, however, utterly irreconcilable with Eratosthenes.

admit such a series of kings, would be the production of monuments, dated in their reigns, which could be proved to be later than the twelfth dynasty, and earlier than the eighteenth; but not a single such monument has yet been produced. Is it meant to be maintained, that this interval was in point of monuments a *Millennium non?* If not, where are the monuments? We can conceive the possibility of an Ojibbeway Indian setting himself to construct a chronology of the English sovereigns; having a very scanty supply of documents, and a very imperfect knowledge of the language in which they are written; and finding among these a list of certain monarchs, whose portraits he had been told were to be seen on the walls of Holyrood House. We can conceive the possibility of such an investigator coming to the conclusion, that the sovereigns in this list must be introduced among the English kings, so as to fill up a supposed gap between Elizabeth and James I.; and, for aught that we at present see to the contrary, we think that he would have about the same grounds for this English middle kingdom, as Chevalier Bunsen has for his Egyptian one. We do not profess to have examined into this question; nor, indeed, are we yet aware what there is to examine; but such are our present impressions; and they are certainly not weakened by the result of the examination *which we have made*, into the Chevalier's arrangement of the earlier kings.

In what we have said on this subject, we have confined ourselves to monumental evidence; laying no stress on the opposition between Chevalier Bunsen's views and the statements of the Bible, as an argument against the correctness of the former. We have met him *on his own ground*, and shown, from purely Egyptian sources, how much he has been mistaken. Having done this, however, we may be permitted to add, that we think—and probably most of our readers will think too—that, taking no account of his claims to inspiration, and regarding him as a mere investigator, Moses had much better means of knowing what chronological knowledge the Egyptians really possessed than either the Chevalier, or any of those comparatively recent writers, in whose reported statements he places so much confidence. We think, too, that if Moses had known that the Egyptians possessed true chronological records of a series of kings, extending back above two thousand years before his time, he would have carried back his history of the ancestors of his countrymen, if he must needs write one, some centuries at least beyond the commencement of that series, before he cut it short by a general deluge. We know the grave imputations which we incur by advancing such an opinion. The Chevalier will give no credit for honesty or for love of truth, to those who will not admit the falsity of the

chronological statements in the book of Genesis. "They have, he says, (vol. i. p. 7.) little knowledge, *or less honesty !*"

We deeply regret the composition and the publication of the present work—we mean, the chronological portion of it; not on account of any injury which it can do to the cause of divine revelation; in that point of view, we regard it as *telum imbelle sine ictu.* But we regret to see time and ingenuity wasted in theorizing on apocryphal lists of kings, which might have been so much better spent in examining the Egyptian monuments, and eliciting from them the facts which they would make known to one who knew how to consult them. It is too early, as yet, to theorize as to either the chronology or the mythology of Egypt. We want in the first instance FACTS. Let as many as possible be collected. Let there be some means devised, by which independent investigators may interchange the facts which they may severally know. When a number of such facts is collected and arranged, it may be the task of the next generation to theorize about them. Above all things, the *language* should be first studied. Until the knowledge of *it* shall be brought to a greater degree of perfection than it now exhibits, even right inferences from the monuments will be received by many with doubt and suspicion. The Chevalier admits vol. i. p. 320, that his present knowledge of the language is very defective. He admits that he has much to learn; and we will venture to add—which he does not seem sensible of—that he has much also to *unlearn*, which he thinks that he knows, before he can accurately translate the *entire* of Egyptian texts. The process which we recommend is a tedious one, but it is sure. He has tried a more rapid one, and we must pronounce him to have failed.

ART. IV.—1. *The Autobiography and Correspondence of Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Bart., during the reigns of James I. and Charles I. Edited by* J. O. HALLIWELL, *Esq., F.R.S.*, &c. 2 vols. London: Bentley, 1845.

2. *A Collection of Public and Private Documents, chiefly illustrative of the Times of Elizabeth and James I. from the original Manuscripts, the property of the Lord Francis Egerton, President of the Camden Society.* Edited by J. PAYNE COLLIER, *Esq.*, London: For the Camden Society, 1840.

3. *The Court of King James the First, by Dr.* GODFREY GOODMAN, Bishop of Gloucester; *to which are added Letters illustrative of the Personal History of the most distinguished Characters in the Court of that Monarch, and his predecessor, now first published from the original manuscripts.* By JOHN S. BREWER, *M.A.*, Queen's College, Oxford. 2 vols. London: Bentley, 1839.

A CENTURY ago the reign of King James the First was read by Englishmen out of a large folio volume, a hundred pages of which contained the life of this monarch, written with some honesty, with much asperity, and in a style remarkably like that of the Seven Champions of Christendom.

This characteristic piece of biography was the work of Arthur Wilson, a friend and client of King James's Earl of Essex. It was first published shortly after his death, which happened about the year 1653. And some sixty or seventy years later, when Bishop Kennet was compiling that complete History of England of which we have spoken in a previous number of this Review, it was selected by the careful prelate as the best memorial of those particular times, to be incorporated in his work. In fact, he had no great choice for this period, as we shall presently see.

The earliest history of this reign was that written by Edmond Howes, the continuator of Stowe, which was composed first in the king's lifetime up to the year 1614, and again, before the civil wars, up to the years 1631. It is curious as having been compiled before the ruin of the Stuarts, for the times were speedily to follow, when the fortunes of this royal house would be told in a very different tone. The axe had scarcely fallen upon Charles, when a variety of publications appeared, suited to the taste of the day. These were mostly low libels, professing an

historical character, and resembling those memoirs of the Court of Louis XV. which were common at the close of the last century. And as it happened that the private life of Charles, like that of Louis XVI., supplied few of the peculiar topics in requisition by writers of this class, they ascended a step higher, where the materials were more abundant, and the truth was more obscure. Thus originated what are called the Secret Histories of the court of king James, works containing probably some truth but more falsehood, and which sin especially in this, that they display in a strong light, and with exaggerated features, the crimes of an abandoned court, as the chief transactions and characteristic events of the reign, and as illustrating the manners of the monarch and his house. The best known of these is the "Court and Character of King James, written and taken by Sir A. W., being an eye and ear witness." The author was Sir Anthony Weldon, sometime a clerk of the king's kitchen, and though the tract is full of spite and bitterness, and was avowedly composed to advise the people "lest they sided with that bloody house," yet some of its scandalous traditions are so intrinsically probable, or so far borne out by other authorities, that they have found a place in our Histories of England; and have contributed not a little to form our received notions of those times. A more respectably written production is that attributed, perhaps falsely, to Fulke Greville, the friend of Sir Philip Sidney. This originally appeared as "Five years of King James, or the State of England at his majesty's entrance, and the relation it had to foreign parts," a subject which, if well treated, would have shown a considerable advance beyond the ordinary conceptions of history in those days. It was afterwards enlarged into a small quarto tract, very well known, but now rather scarce, entitled, "Truth brought to light by Time, or an Historical Relation of the first XIIII years of King James's Reign." This contains, in addition to the original matter, the proceedings in the divorce between the Earl and Countess of Essex, and the arraignment of the murderers of Overbury[1]. Peyton's Divine Catastrophe of the kingly house of Stuart,

[1] The two works are in fact identical. Fulke Greville's *Five Years* (i. e. from 1611 to 1616) appeared in 1643; and this was reprinted in 1651 under the new title of *Truth brought to Light*, &c., and the same title was also given to a separate tract, containing the matter touching the divorce and the arraignment, published at the same time, and generally attached to the former. The editor of Sir S. D'Ewes's Diary has been at the trouble of appending a Secret History of King James, "printed from the original MS. in the Harleian collection. It was written (he adds) immediately after the events here related, for the writer at the close confesses that Monson's trial had not commenced, a circumstance which took place in the latter part of the year 1615." The truth is, that it is nothing more nor less than this identical tract, without addition or variation. And as to its being written before the end of 1615, the editor, in correcting the press, might surely have noticed that Somerset's trial is related, which took place in the year

and Osborne's Memoirs of these times, are publications of the same kind and the same date. They all appeared about the middle of that century, and all tended more or less directly to show that the Stuarts had brought Divine wrath upon their own heads by their own misdoings. These were not unanswered, even at the time. A reply to Sir Anthony Weldon appeared under the title of *Aulicus Coquinariæ*, which takes upon itself to refute five main points of the knight's pamphlet; and the work of Bishop Goodman, now first published, and presently to be referred to, appears to have been composed principally for this same purpose. Unfortunately, these scandalous writers had such materials to work with as ministered to the sharpest appetites of the vulgar. They had truth enough to appease suspicion, and frightfulness enough to satisfy credulity. They combined the great attractions of mystery and murder; of mystery such as modern researches have not cleared, and of murder such as a man would remember for life, if he had but read it in a novel. These productions were in honour during the Commonwealth, and not without credit at subsequent periods, but they had latterly been less known till they were published under Scott's editorship in 1811.

Little more was done during the Protectorate, but with the Restoration there appeared two works of much historical value, Rushworth's Collections, and the Cabala. Rushworth was a Commonwealth man, who wrote for the sake of illustrating the disputes between Charles and the Commons, and only went back to the sixteenth year of king James in order to throw light on the opening of his own subject. The *Cabala*, or *Mysteries of State*, as it was entitled, is an early instance of a collection of political documents, relating both to foreign and domestic affairs, from Henry the Eighth's time downwards. It contains a very useful series of original records, but nothing more. Rushworth connects his documents with sufficient narrative to make them more of a continuous history, and this he extended from time to time. Both these are works of value, and the Cabala of course liable to little imputation, as the collectors interpose no remarks of their own. The historians of Charles the Second's time were naturally less severe upon the king's grandfather, and wrote in a very different spirit from those we have been speaking of. Such were Brady and Frankland; with other defenders of absolute monarchy. The former of these writers did not bring his history to the times in question, but the latter wrote the Annals of

following. Sir Thomas Monson was *arraigned* in 1615, but *tried* neither then nor afterwards. As the author speaks of Northampton's being succeeded in the Treasurership "by my Lord Treasurer that now is," it must have been written before 1618, when Suffolk (Northampton's successor) lost the office.

England from 1612 to 1642, with a strong prejudice against the Puritans and Republicans, and with especial reference to Rushworth, whose collections he thinks have been selected with partiality, and illustrated with unfairness. His work is now very little known, indeed it was never very famous, but Hume, with some sympathy, perhaps, towards his bias, has collated him with Rushworth, and occasionally cited his authority[2]. It is a desultory kind of history, interspersed with numerous transcripts of State papers and other documents, professing to be taken from good sources; but not very clearly so derived. Still there had been no regular history of James the First's reign to supersede Wilson's. The important subject was naturally the time of Charles, and writers did little more than ascend a few steps into the previous reign by way of preface.

A change again came over English History at the Revolution, and, in its results, a most important change it was. There were now two parties in the country, each appealing to history, each writing it, and each confuting the other. Faction produced controversy, and controversy research. To the landing of William III. we owe it that Carte and Ralph wrote not like Speed and Stowe. What Burnet did for history was wonderful, not by teaching others, but by teasing them. His book was like a knight's shield suspended at a cross-road. It was a challenge to all comers, and kept alive the historical contest from generation to generation. Men wrote in earnest too. They were wrangling, not about the descent of Brutus, or the site of Caer-leon, but *de vita et sanguine Turni*. At first, however, the change was of course unfavourable to the Stuarts. The panegyrists of them and their doctrines again gave place to others, who availed themselves of their new license. The reign of James, however, was left without much fresh matter, except that supplied by Hacket in his life of Keeper Williams, and was still without any peculiar historian, so that Bishop Kennet did probably the best he could at the begin-

[2] Brady left behind him a considerable collection of historical MSS. which are still preserved in the Library of Caius College, Cambridge, where the portrait of the author adorns the Combination-room. He was a learned man and an acute controversialist, and his reputation would be more general if he had written less for the times in which he lived. Some day we hope to say more about these MSS. Frankland's History was published anonymously in 1681, under the title of "Annals of King James the First and Charles the First both of happy memory." Hume quotes him by the name of *Franklyn*. His book contains a more circumstantial account of Prince Charles's visit to Spain than is to be found in any other English History. It is remarkable that neither for this, nor for any other of our transactions with Spain, so numerous and important in these times, has any English writer consulted the Spanish historians. Besides Cespedes, who wrote a diffuse narrative of the period, there are many minor authors who treat especially of these occurrences, but the reader will vainly look for their names even in Lingard.

ning of the next century, in making Wilson bear this part in his *Complete History*. And, indeed, Wilson's performance is not a bad one, and should by no means be classed with such books as Weldon's.

Shortly after the accession of the House of Hanover, there appeared a work of singular importance towards the illustration of this reign, more especially as regards the foreign politics of the ministry, and the relations subsisting between this kingdom and the other states of Europe then flourishing. Edmund Sawyer, a barrister, collected into three volumes a series of original documents touching State affairs in the reign of king James and his predecessor. They included the correspondence and instructions of Nevile and Winwood in France and Holland, of Trumbull at Brussels, and Cornwallis at Madrid, together with a vast number of Cecil's despatches to these ambassadors. The whole were published in 1725, by subscription, and under very good encouragement, and they now form the principal source of information respecting these matters. The editor, however, has been defrauded of the just meed of his exertions, for, as the correspondence of Sir Ralph Winwood formed the bulk of the collection, the name of the said Secretary became attached to the work, and it is now universally known as *Winwood's Memorials*, under which title, to the utter exclusion of all other commemoration, the reader will see it appealed to in almost every page of English History at this particular period.

But though this work furnished the means of setting in a better light the conduct of James, or at least of his ministers, yet the character of this monarch did not rise in public esteem. The spirit of the times was against him. It was not only that he was the head of a proscribed family, but his principles were precisely those which all parties were now ridiculing. His scholarship and his politics were as obsolete as his peaked beard and his points. It might have been expected, at all events, that his reluctance to interfere in the affairs of the Continent would, in those days, have been quoted with admiration, and that a peace-making king would have met with some consideration from those who were so bitter against war. Nor was this circumstance forgotten in the controversies of the times. But though Bolingbroke has discussed this reign at great length, and examined the policy of James with especial care, he has given sentence against him throughout, even on the point of his non-intervention, though his arguments are somewhat like those of a man endeavouring to destroy an analogous case which tells strongly against him. Still his opinions have carried much weight, and naturally so too ; for the invective, though fierce, is not vulgar, and it is grounded on truth, though

raised by exaggeration. The reputation of James was altered, but not much improved. Men who believed in nothing, would hardly respect a king who believed in witches. His memory was less odious, but more contemptible. Instead of being charged with poisoning his son, he was charged with writing against tobacco; an imputation more fatal to his dignity in the eyes of a polite club. The wits were amused with a king who really thought there was a devil. The more sober considered him a pedant and a fool, who had contributed at least as much as folly and pedantry could afford to the mischiefs which followed. The critics of the times were content to drop the secret histories, and to resort to the king's own works for their caricatures. The reader who is desirous of seeing what can be done in this way, can refer to Harris's Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of King James I., *after the manner of Mr. Bayle.*

There did appear, however, about the same time, some publications of a different character, at least in point of merit. Birch produced, in 1749, his Historical View of the Negociations between the Courts of England, France, and Brussels, from 1592 to 1617, and he followed up this *quasi* history of king James by a particular Biography of Prince Henry, a person of whom we shall speak by and by. Yet these were not histories of the life and reign of James the First, nor did Carte's work, which actually comprised such a performance, ever obtain a large circulation, or establish itself in the character of a standard History of England, as we have elsewhere remarked in this Review[3]. We suspect that Kennet's compilation approached most nearly to this desired eminence, and thus Wilson's biography conveyed to ordinary students their first impression of James's reign up to the middle of the last century.

At this period Hume stepped forth as an historian, and his first essay was on this identical reign. It thus becomes a curious piece of investigation to discover clearly what he achieved; to take the reign of King James as it had been written before him; to observe the auxiliary materials which had been supplied in the interval; to distinguish between what is due to these, and what is due to himself alone; and to mark those peculiar merits which at once separated him from his predecessors, and raised him to the hitherto unknown dignity of a philosophical historian. It will soon be seen that Hume was not much indebted to new materials. Since Kennet's history very few had been forthcoming. The *ambassades* of La Boderie, the French minister at our court from 1606 to 1611, had just been published, and Hume availed him-

[3] English Review, No. V. p. 4, sqq.

self of these untrustworthy records, as he did also of Sully's Memoirs. But little addition beyond this had been made to the authorities enumerated in the foregoing pages. And some accessible sources of information he appears to have neglected. He does not refer to that amusing mass of miscellaneous intelligence concerning these times contained in Howell's Familiar Letters. He had not, apparently, informed himself of what Carte had just done, nor had Birch's work at this time reached his hands, though he employs it afterwards, in his reign of Queen Elizabeth. It was not, in fact, Hume's practice or province to accumulate new materials, or to look very searchingly through the old ones, as we have observed elsewhere. What then did he do?

He recorded, not very diffusely, the events of the time; remarking on the narrative, as he went along, with much temper and with great judgment. He did too avail himself of the journals of the two houses, not (as his predecessors had done) by inserting in his text speeches or resolutions, but by collecting the temper of parties, and giving the result in a few words. In a small space—for his whole History of England is scarcely larger than Ralph's reign of William and Mary, he gave a lucid history of England, in which, if the details are seldom circumstantial, and sometimes inaccurate, yet the outline of any period is generally correct, the features not distorted, and the perspective well preserved. He told in most cases something very like the truth, but not the whole of it. His philosophy, for which he is so famous, assumes the simple form of good sense. He estimates probabilities with great accuracy. He judges of men and actions as a knowledge of human nature dictates, and he seldom makes a reflection, or draws a conclusion, which may not be considered both sensible and just. But, in thus speaking, we except topics connected with religion.

Such were his qualifications for writing history generally. As regards this particular reign, he came to it with the prepossessions of a Scotchman in favour of James, and the prejudices of a philosopher against his puritanical opponents. The last of these influences was perhaps stronger than the first, but neither seduced him into palpable extravagance. The result was a history much more favourable to King James than had before been written, and as this new work speedily superseded others in ordinary use, the first of the Stuarts became a personage much less contemptible in the eyes of the rising generation than he had been considered by their forefathers.

Yet even thus a portion of the traditional obloquy rested on his memory. The secret histories of his court were republished, as we have mentioned, in the present century, and one of the

most curious of modern scholars, after confessing publicly some thirty years ago that he had commenced his investigations of the Curiosities of Literature, with the popular notion of James's character, sent forth to the world a recantation of his own private opinion as a matter of literary conscience, and endeavoured by arguments and documents to prove that this monarch was neither a pedant nor a despot, but a good scholar and a worthy king. How far our own judgment coincides with Mr. D'Israeli's may be seen by and by. The literary character of James he has well defended, but he has been less successful against Bolingbroke than against Walpole. That Walpole had never opened the books he was so fluently criticising is plain enough. But Bolingbroke has exhibited articles of impeachment against the king's conduct which are clearly stated, and eloquently urged; not drawn from rumours or traditions, but specifying *seriatim* his several errors; and it is a pity that in any professed apology for him, they should not be met as formally as they are advanced.

Since these times the reigns of James and his predecessors on the English throne have been written by an author whose pages no student of history can neglect, though they will seldom please him, often perplex him, and sometimes mislead him. In Dr. Lingard's chapters the reader will find not an authority overlooked, except wilfully. He will see research extended to the most distant limits, and singular acuteness exercised on its results. With all this he will not find the warmth of an advocate, or the wrath of a partizan. Few writers deny themselves the license of an occasional peroration, but Dr. Lingard is one of those few. As far as regards any expression of private opinion, any vehemence of panegyric or censure, his work appears strangely impartial. It is this very suppression of the writer's individuality, this seeming forbearance even on the fittest occasions for interposing, that causes such dissatisfaction. The reserve is not the reserve of modesty, but of design. It is that of a man who makes no statement, because he knows his statement will not be believed. As far as words go, Dr. Lingard is far less severe upon Henry VIII. than is Sir James Macintosh; far less bitter against Cranmer than Mr. Macaulay. Yet his work conveys somehow even a worse impression both of the king and the archbishop. Dr. Lingard never pleads. He makes out his case by putting his own witnesses into the box, and examining them himself. We form our opinions from the evidence, not the speeches. The strongest points are handled with the greatest quietness. When Cranmer kisses the gospels with a private reservation, even Mr. Hallam speaks of his disingenuous shift. Dr. Lingard merely throws out a remark that the security of oaths is dimin-

ished if they are taken in a sense different from that understood by the imposer. When a poor wretch is hanged and embowelled for saying mass privately, Sir James Macintosh launches the whole force of language at the unspeakable atrocity. Dr. Lingard relates the facts without comment, but he adds a note from an eye-witness, who says that the executioner was a bungler, and that the butchery lasted half an hour.

Yet this history is a great acquisition to us. Out of twenty material incidents, we find fifteen set in a new light, if not in a true one; and the very novelty of the view is instructive. Besides, the accounts of a Roman Catholic are the *altera pars* of all our history for the last three hundred years, and it is hard to come to a decision without hearing them. From what we have been saying, it will be seen at once how peculiarly requisite it is to get a correct appreciation of Dr. Lingard's authorities. If these are credible, his case is proved. If they are not, the reader is very insidiously misled. For the period in question, the authorities recently brought to light are numerous, rather than severally important, and on this account require the greater attention. The Clarendon and Hardwicke papers, Murden's collection, and the selection made by Dalrymple from the advocate's Library at Edinburgh, are well-known sources; but, besides these additional helps, Dr. Lingard quotes frequently from MS. documents and letters which may be less faithful informants.

Three more authorities are specified at the head of this article. The name of Sir Simonds D'Ewes has hitherto been principally known by his journals of Queen Elizabeth's parliaments, which were always quoted, and which form the basis of that part of the *Parliamentary History*. His diary, however, was also known and indeed frequently cited from the MS.; and portions of it had been actually published by Hearne in his quaint way of filling up his books with scraps of the most heterogeneous information, just as Casaubon and his contemporaries used to add an explanation of an elegy of Propertius to a note on a construction of Suetonius, and finish up with a Greek epigram on some event of the day. This diary is now published entire. It is less valuable for the times of James I. than those succeeding; as the writer only came into the world, just as James was coming to England, and could consequently know but little of what occurred during his boyhood. His stories are always emphatically gossiping; but sometimes it is very useful to know the gossip of two hundred years ago, and generally very entertaining. His bias is considerable; and allowance must be made for it in all he says for the Puritans, and against the court. The title of the second work sufficiently explains itself; the portion of its contents referring

to these times is very small. The third is more curious. To say that Godfrey Goodman was an English Papist, who was advanced to the see of Gloucester in 1625, would be rather a startling opening of the story. Yet he certainly held tenets higher than those held by gentlemen of the present day, who have been made Papists, just as Bolingbroke says Jansenists were made in France, and Jacobites in England, *viz.* by being called so, and treated as such. And he was undoubtedly made a bishop by his good master King James. After being plundered and ejected like his brethren during the civil wars, he lodged obscurely somewhere in Westminster, and wrote these Memoirs. The book which he refutes throughout, namely Weldon's, did not appear till 1650, and as the bishop died in 1655, his commentaries were composed in the interval. His sole aim seems to have been the conviction of Weldon, whose statements he handles successively throughout his story. His words must be weighed with much caution. Dr. Lingard does not appear to have been aware of the existence of these commentaries, or they would have been evidence after his own heart. The intelligent editor, Mr. Brewer, is not much inclined to find fault with this author's sentiments. We shall refer occasionally to all these as we proceed.

One mischievous effect of the Secret Memoirs to which we have alluded, as well as of the misconception of history generally, was the direction of the student's attention almost exclusively to the court. Even Hume says, that "except during sessions of parliament, the history of this reign may be more properly called the history of the court, than that of the nation." But nothing can be falser history than this. There are periods, it is true, when history becomes necessarily more personal, and more centred in a few individuals, than at other periods. But it is never entirely so, even in France. Generation is always succeeding to generation, and seldom, in Europe, without the development of one or more phases of society. People, if not writing and thinking, are building and trading, or, at all events, living and moving, and marrying and giving in marriage. No European country, excepting, perhaps, England just latterly, has maintained an unaltered position in relation to the other powers for threescore years. And no change in such relative position is without its corresponding effect on the people. But it cannot be for a moment pretended that the times of James I. even approximate in their character to such periods. At the very outset, the position of the nation was entirely changed. Its dominions were doubled in extent. One of the ancient kingdoms of Europe disappears and is merged in ours. And it was not only what we

gained, but what our enemies lost. The Scotch court was the very focus of continental intrigue, and never more so than just before this event. On every occasion the first glance of Paris or Madrid was towards Holyrood or Linlithgow. But all this was now changed. Half the island was no longer an enemy's country. We had no longer to divide an army of ten thousand men, and send five thousand to defend the borders; but we could leave the borders behind us, and ship off twenty thousand to Flanders. We were now indeed *insulani*, with the ocean for our barrier instead of Berwick and Carlisle.

Not less striking were the changes abroad. In this reign Spain, the greatest of the European powers, made the first of those humiliating sacrifices which in less than half a century left her the least. And in that corner of the huge fabric which first crumbled, there arose, and mainly through our agency, a new state; a state at first laughed at, and next hated, but which was presently to form with England the new and formidable class of powers maritime; which in seventy short years was to be the protector of its ancient mistress, and even intercessor with her enemies; and which was to exercise the mightiest influence over the course of events in Europe. The Republic of Holland set an example which was followed in England, and gives Cromwell his chance of a statue; which was debated in Portugal, and nearly cost John of Braganza his chance of a throne; and which in its effects depopulated Naples, and ruined Messina.

Nor can it be said that society remained without progress or change. A disorganization was taking place which materially affected the habits of half the nation. Just at this period, the country gentry broke up their ancient establishments, and dismissed their retainers. The aristocracy of the shires flocked to London, like the French noblesse to Paris, and squandered their fortunes in the grossest and most abandoned licentiousness. Royal proclamations were vain against this new mania. The effect went to complete what the wars of the Roses and the rise of the commons had commenced, and almost destroyed the last traces of feudalism. They were not quite destroyed, it is true, for in the next reign the country gentry could still muster their troops to join the royal standard, but perhaps the issue of the wars might have been in some degree changed, if the multitude of retainers and serving men who were now sent abroad upon the world had remained to swell the squadrons of their masters. The luxury of the times was excessive. Not even the abbots and sacrists of the fourteenth century were so lavish and magnificent in their buildings as these lords of the seventeenth. The public mind was in a continued state of ferment throughout this

reign of peace. The spirit which had arisen under Elizabeth, to do its work under Charles, was rapidly, and not secretly, extending itself. The feelings of the nation, as regarded its neighbours, underwent an entire alteration. In one point this is especially remarkable. The strange feelings of awe with which our ancestors in the sixteenth century regarded the Spaniards, have not escaped the notice of historians; and they have been likened to those with which a savage might look towards an Englishman. But in thirty years all this had been reversed. The writers of James's time speak of Spain as France might now speak of China. The country was still disliked, but no longer feared. Its wretchedness and poverty are already laughed at. A score of years had not passed since the whole force of the island had been marched to meet the Spanish invader with less of daring than of despair, with a resolution of dying in the field rather than with a hope of escaping defeat. Now, at the news of a peace with Spain, all the nation is indignant. Ambassadors confess gravely in their despatches that the country had lost its most glorious opportunity of aggrandizement. The tone of the people was like that of sailors forbidden to engage a Frenchman, and robbed of their lawful prize-money. Vessels used to be sent to the Spanish colonies with the same regularity and much the same expectations that they now sail with for the whale fishery. And only a few years later, the parliament, clergy, and commons, are all raving mad, because King James will not do what Marlborough was thought demented for doing a century after, because he will not march an English army to the Danube, and that against the combined forces of Austria and Spain. How can the history of these times be the history rather of the court than of the nation?

The truth is, that so it had been written, but so it ought not to have been written. Hume's predecessors had so viewed it, but he should not have followed them, nor, in point of fact, has he altogether done so.

The title of James I. to the throne of England has been the subject of curious controversy. That the first of the Stuarts, the head of that house who carried the doctrines of hereditary right so high, and with results so fatal to themselves, was particularly deficient in a good title to his crown, was observed by Bolingbroke. But Bolingbroke overlooked the main point. He merely asserted that the succession to the crown from the earliest times had notoriously not been governed by hereditary right, and that the title of Henry VII., from whom James deduced his, was even more irregular than ordinary. Mr. Hallam first showed reasons for coming to the conclusion that no

one of the Stuarts was, in the strict sense of the word, a legitimate sovereign, and that the title of this family to the throne was, in point of fact, very analogous to that of the family who succeeded them. He proves his case by four propositions. 1. That a lawful king of England, with the advice and consent of parliament may make statutes to limit the inheritance of the crown. 2. That King Henry VIII. was by statute invested with such powers. 3. That he did thus entail the inheritance on the issue of his younger sister Mary to the exclusion of his elder sister Margaret, queen of Scots. 4. That such issue was living at the decease of Elizabeth. From these propositions he proves that James was not the legal heir, and that he was constituted a lawful king only as William III. was so constituted, viz. by the choice of the people and the recognition of parliament. Now these propositions, we think, are true, but they only prove this, that the first title of the Stuarts to the throne was not parliamentary,—a fact which few of their supporters would care about acknowledging. It would surely have been bootless to have set about persuading a Jacobite that James did not originally derive his title from act of parliament. Yet these were the persons who upheld the family claim, and *they* would have denied Mr. Hallam's first proposition. Such denial would be perilous, no doubt, but not more so than the march to Derby. James I. came in to the exclusion of those who were *not* the lineal heirs, William III. to the exclusion of those who were. Both were alike the choice of the people over others, but with this difference in the premises: the offer of the crown to William was a transfer, to James it might have been termed a restitution. No advocate of constitutional freedom would have doubted either the truth or the consequence of Mr. Hallam's propositions, but these were the precise parties with whom such arguments were not required. The parties to be convinced were the advocates of divine right, and against these the proof would have failed.

The truth is, there was no other candidate but James in a plight to contest the prize for a moment. The descendants of Mary of Suffolk were utterly powerless, and the claim of the Spanish infanta was too ludicrously preposterous to be thought of. Nor do we mean to say that the point of lineal descent was without its weight, independent of the acquisition of a kingdom —an acquisition which was by no means duly appreciated at first. And, moreover, the new king had this especial advantage, that all parties were in the dark as to his disposition. He was a Protestant, and this pleased the people. He was thought to lean to his own Church, and this pleased the Puritans. All writers appear surprised at the singular tranquillity attending his acces-

sion. The fact is, that all parties were quiet, because all expected to be gainers. And the necessary disappointment of some was the cause of those explosions which perplex historians as much as the previous tranquillity. One thing explains the other. Cecil's friends hoped to be taken into confidence as well as Cecil. The Roman Catholics hoped for great things from the son of Queen Mary, and the correspondent of the pope. Both parties were disappointed. From the disappointment of the first arose Raleigh's conspiracy; from the second, the Gunpowder Treason.

Few monarchs have been the object of more desperate and audacious plots than king James. The seizure of his person during his Scottish reign had been a matter of almost ordinary occurrence. And his misfortunes had this peculiar aggravation, that they were seldom credited. When the news of the Gowrie conspiracy reached Edinburgh, the first impression of the people was disbelief. Before the mysterious circumstances of the case could have attracted attention, before any contradiction could have been fairly detected by a comparison of evidence, the affair was discredited. On the first blush of the matter, on the bare tidings that the king's life had been attempted, but happily saved, the ministers of the city refuse to believe the particulars communicated by the council. Raleigh's plot was called a contrivance of Cecil. And even after the detection of Guy Fawkes with the lantern in his hand, attempts were made to throw discredit on this matter too. Bishop Goodman, forty years afterwards, in speaking of the gunpowder plot, mentions as a remarkable feature in it, that it was "generally acknowledged as a truth on all sides."

That persons of different character and pursuits should engage together in a conspiracy with different motives, and for different ends, is known to be not improbable; and if the conspiracy be hasty and ill concerted, the evidence of its existence may be made to appear incredible and self-contradictory. And such was the case with this plot of Raleigh's. It is now clear that there were *two* treasons on this occasion, the first called the "Main," and the other the "Bye." The first was Cobham's and Raleigh's, which might have had some grand object *in nubibus*, but which certainly never proceeded farther than a few negotiations with the Spanish ambassador. The second was that of Markham and Brooke, with the fixed object, but indefinite means, of procuring from the king some liberty of conscience for Papists and Puritans. When it is considered, that though these plots went on together, the agents were unacquainted, at all events, with the details of each other's schemes; that both schemes were indefinite, and both abortive; and that the evidence was mainly sought

from the confessions and recriminations of the parties, it can hardly be matter of surprise that the result of the investigations was unintelligible [4]. It was impossible to detect what the witnesses themselves could not tell—the ultimate aim, for instance, of Raleigh and Cobham; but perhaps, as much as was to be learnt is now known. Hume tells the story in a page and a half, just as he found it in ordinary authorities, and leaving it just as unintelligible. In Lingard it will be found related with the utmost clearness of detail, and confirmed by all such evidence as has since come to light.

The famous gunpowder treason is a far more interesting subject of enquiry, especially in the chapters of a Romish historian. The method in which Dr. Lingard treated the massacre of St. Bartholomew, is generally known from its discussion in the pages of a popular review. He has conducted this case in a manner more ingenious, and, we think, more successful; he makes no attempt to deny the reality of the danger, or to treat it as a stratagem of Salisbury's. He offers no direct palliation of the enterprise, which he describes as "so atrocious in principle, and so sanguinary in execution, that it is difficult to conceive how it could be harboured in the mind of any human being." He wishes, however, to establish the following points: 1. That the body of English Papists was entirely ignorant of the plot. 2. That the English Jesuits had no knowledge of it, except such as Greenway learnt from Catesby in confession, and communicated to Garnet his provincial. These points, we think, he goes nearly to prove, and, with this, a partial justification of the conspirators is indirectly conveyed by an elaborate recital of the persecutions with which their religion was then visited. With such a preface, constructed not with declamation nor arguments, but from an assemblage of authenticated details, the story opens, in the spring of 1604, eighteen months before the catastrophe. The traitors, at first but four in number out of the whole kingdom, are represented as suspending their operations till the conclusion of the treaty between England and Spain had destroyed all chance of Philip's mediation. When every ray of hope is extinguished, they exhort each other to brave death "like the Maccabees" for the liberation of their brethren. The current of the narrative is only interrupted by notices of the increasing severity of the persecution; and the circumstance that the conspirators succeeded, in March 1605, in conveying two hogsheads and thirty

[4] Bishop Goodman says, "This (i. e. Gunpowder Plot) was in effect the only treason in the time of King James, for that of the Lord Cobham and Sir Walter Raleigh, I conceive, was but a kind of embryo, wherein discontented persons had but a kind of plot to betray one another."

barrels of powder into the vaults, is coupled with the mention of a rumour, that, in the next parliament, measures would be taken for the entire extirpation of the ancient faith. This is not exactly such a history of the gunpowder plot as would be gathered from Mr. Close's Anniversary Sermon, but, of the two, it is the truer one.

It may be observed, that the conspirators had, before this, been under the suspicion of the government. Not only had Catesby, Tresham, and Percy been concerned in the treason of Essex, but the two former of these, and both the Wrights, had actually been put under arrest, at the death of Elizabeth, as dangerous characters. They do not, however, seem to have been suspected now, even by Cecil, though it is clear, from documents in Birch's Negotiations, and from his own letter afterwards, that he was more than once warned from abroad that something was in hand. But when the continued prorogation of parliament had rendered additional funds indispensable, and Tresham, at length, for this purpose, was taken into confidence, the death-blow was given to this infernal plot. This did not occur till the 15th of October, so reluctantly was Tresham trusted. From this period, the story assumes a complexion very different from that which it wears in ordinary histories of England. It seems clear that Tresham, from his first admission into the secret, was completely frightened, and resolved at once to frustrate the design with as little mischief as possible to his associates. Before ten days had elapsed he went to Catesby, and suggested that the explosion should be postponed from the opening to the close of parliament. He said that delay was necessary to enable him to raise money; and he pleaded earnestly that Lord Monteagle, his brother-in-law, might have warning given him. Now this Lord Monteagle himself had been engaged in some of the treasons of the Papist party, and it seems extremely probable that he had been already enlightened by Tresham, and that all the following piece was played between the two in order to frighten the conspirators into an abandonment of their projects. On October 26, Monteagle, much to the surprise of the family, ordered supper to be prepared at one of his houses a little way out of town, instead of at his usual residence, which was at Bethnal Green. During the meal, the celebrated letter was left for him, brought in, and read by one of his gentlemen named Ward[5]. On the next day, the 27th, Ward called personally on Winter, one of the traitors, and

[5] It was scarcely possible to doubt that Tresham was the writer of the letter, yet some have done so. The MSS. of the conspirators in the possession of Dr. Lingard show that they all attributed it to him. Bishop Goodman mentions it as a well-known fact. Sir E. Hobart writing to Sir T. Edwards at Brussels a fortnight after the dis-

related this occurrence to him, advising him, if he had any thing to do with the plot to take himself off. Winter immediately informed Catesby and Percy, who, on the 30th, sent a message to Tresham to meet them at Enfield, with the resolution of killing him, if they found good ground for their suspicions. But he stood the trial and protested his innocence of the matter. It does not seem quite clear when the information was first conveyed to Cecil [6]. The letter was laid before James on the first of November, a circumstance of which Winter was immediately apprised by this same Ward. Tresham was again repaired to, and he this time said, that he had learnt that ministers knew of the mine, though he could not tell how. This was on the 2nd. Still, however, they took courage from the fact, that the cellar had not been searched, and they were confirmed by Percy (who came to town on the 3rd) in their resolution of waiting for the worst. And then followed the events of the 5th.

Few persons, we imagine, after considering these particulars, will doubt but that the whole plan of the discovery was concerted, step by step, between Tresham and Monteagle. It is absurd to suppose that no more ingenious method could have been devised for preventing Monteagle's attendance on parliament, than the sending him so suspicious a letter as this, at least nine days earlier than was necessary. In fact, it had been determined to save others too, and the security of several had been actually cared for without giving rise to any suspicions at all. Digby, in his letter to his wife, says, "I do not think there would have been three worth saving that should have been lost. You may guess that I had some friends in danger, which I prevented, but they shall never know it." Whether Mounteagle, in communicating the letter to the council, gave them any further insight into its meaning or not, may be doubted. We think the probability is that he did so; and Cecil's adroitness could easily so manage it that the discovery might appear to come from the king. Yet in his letter to the British ambassadors afterwards, he openly takes the credit for himself and Suffolk.

covery, says, "Such as are apt to interpret all things for the worst, will not believe other but that Monteagle might in policy cause this letter to be sent, fearing this discovery of (i. e. made by?) the letter: the rather that one Thomas Ward, a principal man about him, is suspected to be accessory to the treason, others otherwise." Cecil's letter to Cornwallis (Winwood II. 171.) says that Monteagle, when he accompanied Suffolk on the 4th into the vault, and the latter was told that the faggots belonged to one Mr. Percy, "took notice that there was great profession between Percy and him, from which some inference might be made that it was the warning of a friend." Yet Monteagle could not really have supposed that Percy sent the letter.

[6] It must, however, have been very soon after the delivery of the letter, for Cecil in the despatch last quoted implies, that they kept it a day or two before showing it to the king, which they did on the 1st.

Hume's narrative of the plot contains few of the details given above, and indeed many of them were not known at the time he was writing. But it is not only by the inaccuracy or incompleteness of particulars, that his pages convey a wrong impression to the reader. *Tantum religio potuit suadere malorum* is the moral, which, as applicable to all creeds alike, he insinuates throughout. He represents the previous conduct of the conspirators as "liable to no reproach," and observes that they were not men of desperate fortunes or profligate habits, so that "bigoted zeal" and "holy fury" are made responsible for the whole iniquity. We have, however, remarked a page or two back, that the conspirators had borne very suspicious characters for some years past. It is requisite, too, in order to get a good view of the matter, to distinguish between the original contrivers of the plot, and those who were only taken in as the catastrophe approached. These latter persons were men of a better stamp, and probably aimed chiefly, if not solely, at the advancement of their religion. Such was Digby, whose words Hume quotes to confirm his own reflections[7]. But Digby was only admitted to the secret a month before the time. The real gunpowder traitors—the persons whose principles and conduct must characterize the scheme—were Catesby and Percy. Catesby had been a man of the most abandoned habits, and most reckless dissipation. He had ruined his fortune by his extravagance, and he was notorious as having been engaged, for some purpose or other, in perpetual plots against the government. Percy was of no better repute. He had two wives, Bishop Goodman says, one in the north and the other in the south, and lectures on atheism were reported to be read in his house. "So I conceive," adds the Bishop, "that he was not very religious." Now these are not those kind of characters whose crimes are to be imputed to religious enthusiasm[8].

It is not altogether easy to form at once a correct idea of this famous treason. That Catesby and Percy devised the scheme originally without some political or personal aims, will hardly be

[7] Burnet, in the summary prefixed to his history, quotes these very words of Digby to show that there really was a plot. And there probably Hume saw them. The bishop describes how the original letters were found in an old cupboard when the family was broken up.

[8] Dr. Lingard represents all the original conspirators except Winter and Fawkes as having but recently embraced the Romish faith. It is certain that a considerable number of people became converts just at this time, and James alluded to the fact in his first speech to Parliament. It should be observed, that for many of the details of this plot Dr. Lingard relies on two MS. narratives in his possession, written by the Jesuits Gerard and Greenway. These are of course suspicious authorities; still there must be many particulars which none but such persons could tell, and which they could have no interest in misrepresenting.

believed, though no such particulars were permitted to transpire[9]. That the persecutions at this time were most iniquitous and cruel is undeniable, and this too under the sway of a new monarch, a period which had been anxiously looked for as promising to terminate the miseries of years. If the Papists had risen against their oppressors in arms—if they had collected themselves in some corner of the country—if they had garrisoned Exeter, and even drawn succours from Spain, they would have been no more liable to historical censure than the Protestants of Rochelle, or the Camisards of the Cevennes. The people who rose against Charles I. and James II. were not suffering more grievous impositions than the Papists suffered now. The infamy of this plot arises from the horrible wickedness of the means devised—a wickedness so far transcending the ordinary accompaniments of rebellion; from the utter improbability there was that the catastrophe, even if fully achieved, could have gratified the conspirators in any point except revenge; and from the deliberate malice with which they pondered for eighteen months over a purpose almost too atrocious for the first impulse of momentary frenzy. And in popular histories and declamations, this peculiar villany is generally connected with the essential tenets of Popery, as if no creed but this could prompt or promote such a characteristic plot. It cannot be denied that religious feelings, if they did not originate this treason, at least kept it alive. It was a Popish plot in growth, if not in conception. Whatever may have actuated the ringleaders, the majority of the little band who subsequently joined them, after hesitating, as well they might, at the first proposals, did, beyond a doubt, suffer themselves to be convinced that this outrageous massacre was justifiable on the score of religion, and forwarded it with the sole view of advancing, or perhaps, to speak more fairly, of protecting, the faith they professed. Yet it should be remembered that the number of such persons was exceedingly small; that they had been selected singly by the leaders, with the greatest care, as the fittest objects of temptation; and that, as they were not consulted till the

[9] The prisoners admitted in their confessions, that it was intended to appoint a Lord Protector of the realm, though his name was not known. It was probably Northumberland, who was suspected at the time, though the ministers were afraid to say much about it. Sir E. Hobart tells Edmondes of this rumour, and connects the French ambassador with the business. The manifesto acquitting all foreign powers of any share in the guilt, reads very much as if some of them were actually thought guilty; but it seems extremely improbable that Henry IV. could have been concerned, though he was certainly pointed at. Fulke Greville in his "Five Years" says, the aim of the conspirators was "not so much to establish their own religion (for which purpose they pretended it), but to establish their own power and pre-eminence, and to raise some private families to greatness and dignity."

eleventh hour, they had less time for reflection and dismay. One of the twelve, too, a strict Papist, did actually at last prevent the conspiracy, under the influence of these feelings; for, that such were the motives which prompted Tresham, and not the compassion either for a Papist or a brother-in-law, is abundantly clear. Above all, it must be borne in mind that it is quite certain that the Papists, as a body, were entirely ignorant of the design, and that it is not proved that any priest of that Church gave it his countenance or approval [1].

These plots gave King James but an ill promise of peace on his newly gained throne. They formed, however, the last of that remarkable series of designs which had been projected against him, and he rested undisturbed, at all events by similar attacks, for the remaining twenty years of his reign. It was at this period, when the troubles connected with his accession had been quieted, and those arising from his continental alliances had not commenced, that those strange passages occurred at his court, which have formed the staple of the Secret Histories, and stamped their character on the times. The king had always been surrounded by a number of persons, not exclusively, though mainly Scotchmen, to whom he was attached either by gratitude or caprice; but some years elapsed before he selected any especial favourite, or permitted any monopoly of the royal grace. Lingard, however, is in error in tracing this change to the death of Cecil, for Carr was in favour in 1610, and was created Viscount Rochester in 1611, whereas Salisbury did not die till the following year, and had not long previously experienced any disfavour. If a man fills the post of prime favourite without being generally hated while living, or generally abused when dead, he is entitled to some credit, and such was the case with Somerset. He was not a man of talent or of principle, of sagacity or of caution; but either by his manners or disposition, or by both, he certainly made himself somewhat popular while in power, and earned a good word in disgrace, and after death [2]. Weldon allows him

[1] Bishop Goodman confirms Dr. Lingard's view of the conduct of the Romish clergy. He says, "It hath since appeared that divers priests, in their letters to Rome, did much complain that they found the Catholics very desperate, and that they could not persuade them to any obedience, but did much fear they intended mischief." But the bishop's statements must be received throughout with the same caution as those of a Romish writer.

[2] The reader will find considerable variation in the general colouring given to this story. The Secret Histories generally represent Overbury in a favourable light in order to make the case blacker. This line is taken by Greville and by Weldon; and the *Aulicus Coquinariæ* admits that Weldon's statements on this point are tolerably accurate. Wilson's attachment to Essex made him speak very strongly, and as Hume here rests on his sole authority he has taken his tone. Goodman seems disinclined to say much about the matter. Lingard takes an exactly opposite view of the case,

considerable praise, and Bishop Goodman speaks of him with marked respect. There can be no doubt though, that in many of these panegyrics the chief object is to contrast him invidiously with Buckingham. It is hardly safe to take a man's character from his own lips, but there is a curious letter of Somerset's to Northampton in the Egerton Papers, in which the favourite appeals, as to a well-known fact, to his "carefulness to preserve the nobility here, rather than invade the right of any," and avers himself to be the courtier "whose hands never took bribe." These claims tally precisely with the acknowledgments of Weldon, and they point exactly to such a disposition as would have secured him a good name at the least expense. We do not find it satisfactorily shown at what particular period Somerset was introduced to the friend whose name and fate were afterwards so notorious [3]. It must, however, have been soon after his own appearance at court, for in September, 1611, he was in disgrace for a supposed offence offered to the queen, which she never forgot.

Thomas Overbury was a gentleman of decent extraction, the son of an ancient bencher of the Middle Temple. With the approbation, and, it is said, at the instance of the king, he was early attached to the person of the favourite, in the capacity of a friend and confidant, to aid him with his experience, and especially, in later times, to assist him in that business of state which after Cecil's death was entrusted to his hands. That he discharged this office with considerable ability is allowed on all sides, but his temper is represented as violent, and his manners as overbearing; and it is clear from his actions that he was both unprincipled and unscrupulous. That he, as well as his master, was obnoxious to the queen there can be no doubt, but we see no sufficient grounds for asserting that he was disliked by James. He filled the invidious post of a favourite's favourite, with some skill and no extraordinary disrepute, for no mention of any disturbance occurs, excepting the pettish displeasure of the queen in 1611. The year 1612 ended well for him and his master. Cecil was dead; who, if he had done no more, had occasionally intercepted the stream of royal favour which was flowing so profusely to Carr. Prince Henry was dead also, who was in some

abusing Overbury and exculpating Somerset as far as he can; from no motive, that we can imagine, except his ordinary one of going counter to the received version of a story.

[3] Bacon describes Overbury as "known to have great interest and strait friendship with my Lord Somerset, both in his meaner fortunes and after." State Trials, II. 974. Other statements represent him as introduced to Somerset by James. Mr. Brewer has printed (from Birch's collection) a letter from Overbury to Salisbury, showing that his disgrace was in Sept. 1611, and also one from the queen, in which she styles him "*that fellow.*"

degree a rival, though perhaps not an enemy. There does not in fact seem to have been any party formed against Carr, as long as he held merely the first place in his sovereign's affections, without being prominently set forward as his counsellor. Weldon says, that as James was notoriously bent on a favourite, schemes were tried by all parties to get the appointment, but that when the place was accidentally filled by Carr, they acquiesced in the fortuitous settlement of the question.

Now, however, during the vacancy of offices which ensued on the death of Salisbury, considerable jealousy arose between the Howards—Suffolk and Northampton, and the favourite, and in this interval of ministerial anarchy, the services of Overbury were in great demand. It is needless to recite that at this period Carr had conceived a violent passion for the Lady Frances Howard, daughter of Suffolk, and wife of the Earl of Essex. The question appears to have been regarded at court simply as one of convenience. James, though he had contrived the original match between Essex and his lady, was glad to please his favourite, and anxious to embrace what he thought so simple a method of reconciling parties. Suffolk and Northampton, the lady's father and uncle, made no objection to the arrangement, and it was agreed that the Lady Essex should sue for a divorce from her husband, and marry Carr. The only dissentient was Overbury, who, though he had been the chief abettor in the previous passages between Carr and the lady, was averse to the project of a marriage, which he opposed with much violence of temper and language, using the remarkable threat, that he both could and would throw a fatal obstacle in its way. It is not difficult, of course, to discover considerations which might have influenced him in this conduct, apart from any of the more respectable motives which some writers have given him credit for. No act, however, of overt hostility was committed towards him till the 21st of April, when he was suddenly sent to the Tower. The reason given for his arrest was his refusal of an embassy which the king had just offered him. It happens that we possess a remarkable letter of Sir H. Wotton's, written the day after, in which he states that Overbury, only two hours before his commitment, had told him with his own mouth that he "conceived himself never better of his own fortunes and ends,"—a remark very characteristic of the man's presumption. No sooner was he imprisoned than the formal suit for a divorce was instituted, and the requisite sentence obtained, not without great notoriety and scandal. The proceedings lasted nearly six months, and just as they terminated Overbury expired in the Tower, on the 15th of September, 1613. That his death should at once be attributed

to poison was not remarkable, since few deaths of eminent persons occur unattended with similar suspicions. On the 26th of December following, Carr, created Earl of Somerset for the occasion, was married to the divorced countess,—a proceeding somewhat unreservedly stigmatized even at the time. Such are the bare circumstances of the first part of this drama.

The year 1614, though a stormy period in parliament, was not attended with any remarkable events at court, excepting the death of Northampton, who expired in July. The marriage of Somerset had produced the desired effect in reconciling the court factions, and things went on pretty smoothly till the spring of the next year 1615. On the 23rd of April, George Villiers was sworn in as a gentleman of the privy chamber, which was the first step in the rapid rise of the new favourite. This was a sufficient indication that the royal favour was at least divided, if not transferred. On the 1st of August Somerset was arrested in the royal presence at Royston, charged with being concerned in the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury.

The particulars were soon public. It transpired that the scheme of offering Overbury an ambassadorship, and persuading him to refuse it, had been preconcerted, in order to get him into the Tower. When he was there, it was contrived to surround him with agents in the plot. Wade, the lieutenant of the Tower, was removed, and Sir Gervase Elwes appointed in his room. A man named Weston had been placed in particular attendance on the prisoner, and this man had poisoned him. The poisons were furnished to Weston by the countess, who had procured them from Franklin, an apothecary, by the assistance of Mrs. Turner, a woman of infamous character, who had also been instrumental in the scandalous transactions preceding the divorce. These operations had extended over a space of nearly five months, during the whole of which time poisons had been periodically administered, till at last they took effect. The circumstances of the discovery are differently told. By some it is said that the apothecary's boy, who had been shipped off for safety's sake to Flanders, had there divulged particulars which Trumbull, our ambassador in those parts, thought fit to communicate to secretary Winwood. Other statements allege, that the secretary, happening to meet Sir Gervase Elwes at dinner at Lord Shrewsbury's, learnt from him enough to lead to the whole disclosure[4].

[4] This is the version given by D'Ewes of the matter, and Bacon said the same at the trial. Somerset also, in writing to James after his sentence, describes Elwes as "the worst deserver in this business; an unoffended instrument might have prevented all after-mischief, who for his own ends suffered it, and by the like arts afterwards betrayed it." Cabala, 222. Weldon and Wilson give the story of the apothecary's boy, and they are followed by Hume.

Winwood communicated the matter to the king, who sent for Coke, to whom he committed the investigation. The result was the apprehension of Somerset, as we have stated. Between the 19th of October and the 9th of December, Weston, Mrs. Turner, Sir G. Elwes, and Franklin were all tried and executed. Somerset and his countess were detained in prison till the 24th of the next May. In the interval the earl and countess were subjected to repeated private examinations, Bacon being the chief agent in the business. It was clear that the king wished to avoid a trial, and to that end Somerset was advised to plead guilty, by a prospect of pardon, but this he refused to do [5]. It was also clear, however, that he was as much averse to a trial as the king, but that he did not choose to humour his majesty on his own terms. To gain his end, he solicited an interview, or permission to correspond privately. When these requests were denied, he employed menaces, and threatened to make disclosures if he were put on his trial. At last he feigned sickness and madness, but all to no purpose. He and his wife were convicted, the latter pleading guilty, but both received pardon.

Such are the ascertainable details of this scandalous story; a story which originated and supplied all the libels of the day. For it is upon this that all the Secret Histories turn, it being connected in some of them with other crimes equally black, but not equally clear, and made to ramify through all the court intrigues of this portion of the reign. And it cannot be denied that many mysterious circumstances of the transaction remain unexplained, which perplex the best judgments of modern historians. These relate to certain secrets of which both Overbury and Somerset declared themselves the possessors, and with the disclosure of which Overbury first threatened Somerset, and Somerset afterwards threatened the king. It has been inferred, from these circumstances, that all three parties were conscious of some criminal deed, either perpetrated or planned, which would not bear the light; that Overbury was first put out of the way, with the king's sanction, to prevent his telling tales; and that the publication of these matters was what the earl threatened, and the king feared, on his trial. Such is the opinion formed by Mr. Hallam.

Unfortunately the histories which should help to enlighten us on these points are of little service, being mainly taken up with

[5] James was very cautious and niggardly in his promises to Somerset. He seems to have been afraid of public opinion if he showed him too much lenity. Bacon, that the king's word might not be compromised, suggested that these promises should be added "by the messenger, as from himself;" so that they might afterwards be repudiated. See his letter to Buckingham of May 5. Works, IV. 624. Ed. 1740.

gossip and anecdote, to the exclusion of such facts and dates as we might base our judgment on. Our chief materials are the details to be gathered from Bacon's letters, and the State Trials.

The insufficiency, at first sight, of the motives generally alleged for the imprisonment and murder of Overbury, particularly as they regard Somerset himself, may certainly lead to a suspicion that there were others working more secretly. As far as the Countess is concerned, there is nothing extravagant in supposing that a woman of strong passion and violent temper should be ready to resort to any extremities against a man who had threatened to defeat her favourite schemes, and who had spoken of her in terms of unmeasured insult and abuse. And it may perhaps be thought that the part taken by the earl in the business is no more than may be explained by the well-known fact, that her influence over him was unbounded, and more than sufficient to secure such co-operation. That a woman should be abetted by her paramour in an act of sanguinary revenge against a man who had offended them both, is not very strange. Still the question will recur, Why were such extraordinary means employed? Surely, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, a nobleman could get rid of a troublesome confidant, or a fractious counsellor, without having recourse to such a complication of intrigues. And even if nothing short of his death would expiate his offences, it could hardly have been necessary to bring this about in the Tower, and by means of the king's lieutenant; a circumstance which was actually pressed on the trial as a great aggravation of the murder. If Overbury did really threaten to stop the marriage, it may be said that he must have had possession of some secret to reveal which would have been Somerset's ruin; for the supposition of Dr. Lingard, that this referred merely to his power of exposing the previous criminality of the parties, is quite improbable. There can be no doubt but that the lady's friends, and the king, and all in fact who were interested in the matter, were already pretty well aware of the antecedent circumstances, which were not likely to be scrutinized with any rigid severity. Nor was it probable that Overbury's single testimony to this effect, when opposed by all the weight of the other side, would have been allowed such consideration as to impede the marriage. Still we may conceive, without much difficulty, that an overbearing favourite, who presumed that all his master's past successes and future hopes were alike attributable to his counsels, might, in a fit of exasperation, use big words and threatening language, without any such definite meaning as in this case has been inferred. For it is impossible to doubt that in the state affairs which Somerset and Overbury had

transacted together for the twelve months previous, many confidential communications must have taken place; nor is it unlikely, considering the times and the reign, that some of these involved subjects never intended to be made public. Bacon, in his speech for the prosecution, pressed this point strongly, but that was merely to prove malice in Somerset. And if his instructions were to mislead the court (as Mr. Hallam supposes), this would go to show the contrary. Yet, on the whole, we think that the first of the four conclusions which Mr. Hallam lays down as established, viz. that Overbury's death was occasioned not merely by Lady Somerset's revenge, but by his possession of important secrets, which he had threatened to divulge—remains still uncertain.

Even less are we inclined to conclude that James was a consenting party to this murder. The Secret Histories give us very little insight into the real state of things at Court, and we have few means of learning how Overbury was regarded by James, and whether the king's feelings towards him underwent any change, and if so, at what period. That Overbury was obnoxious to the queen and prince Henry, as Bacon averred in his speech, is probable enough, but we have found no good authority for Dr. Lingard's statement, that he could never obtain the favour of the king. Sir Henry Wotton's letter, before quoted, observes that James had a good while been disgusted with the said gentleman, but this is mere gossip, told without much information, as the rest of the letter shows. That James proposed to send him on an embassy, with a full knowledge that Somerset wished to be rid of him, is no doubt true, and perhaps he not unreluctantly punished his refusal by sending him to the Tower; but it is easy to see that Somerset could have procured the king's co-operation thus far upon very ordinary pretences. Our best evidence is to be drawn from the conduct of James at the disclosures. The first hint of the murder, and the first clue to the conviction of the parties concerned, was given privately to the king by Winwood, and it was then clearly in his power to have stifled the inquiry. Instead of doing so, he at once put himself in communication with the original informant, then committed the investigation of the business to Coke, the most intractable as well as the keenest of his judges, and afterwards took extraordinary pains in charging them all to omit no point whatever in the thorough sifting of the business. These circumstances we think irreconcilable with the supposition that the king himself was a party to the murder.

The question of Somerset's hold upon the king is a more intricate one, and its decision may in some degree affect that above discussed, since if there were any momentous secret between the

earl and James, it is highly probable that Overbury also shared it. Of the transactions concerning Somerset's trial, which gave rise to these suspicions, we collect a most curious record from the State Trials, and from Bacon's letters. The minor criminals were no sooner despatched, than the case of Somerset and his lady was taken into consideration. Four months were spent in private examinations and in negotiations, the management of which was entrusted to Bacon. The first of his letters—some of which are addressed to the king, and some to Buckingham—is dated Jan. 22, 1616, and refers to a conversation just had with his Majesty on the matter. They are continued down to the trial in May. From these documents it may be inferred, first, that James was anxious to procure a conviction, and somewhat doubtful of such an issue. For, however little question may now be made about the guilty consent (to say the least) of Somerset, yet such was not the universal opinion then, nor afterwards. Even Weldon gives as his own belief, and that of most others, that the earl's part in the deed went no further than the imprisonment. Nor do we think it certain that the evidence on which he was found guilty would procure his conviction in a court of justice at the present day. Bacon tells the king that this evidence, though of a "good strong thread," needs to be well woven and spun together. He proposed also that the Countess should be tried last, lest she should say any thing towards clearing her husband, and that any digression of hers to this effect should be silenced. And in a very remarkable letter of April 28th, he discusses what plans would be best in the various events of the trial. To this are affixed the king's marginal notes, or *apostilles*. If Somerset should make a clean conscience and confess beforehand, James *still wishes that the public trial should be gone through*. If the lady confesses, and the earl pleads not guilty, and is found guilty, (as Bacon "thinks likeliest," and as really happened,) James wishes for stay of judgment. If he refuses to plead at all, time is to be given him to change his mind; and if he be acquitted (which Bacon "should be very sorry it should happen") the lord steward is to remand him to the Tower, to be questioned further in the Star-chamber, on other high and heinous offences, *though not capital*. Now from all this it may be inferred, secondly, that James had no wish to stop a public trial, nor any desire to remove or silence Somerset by death; though he wished him to owe his safety not to a public acquittal, but to such an exercise of the royal mercy as would secure his future dependence and respect.

It becomes then a question for decision, whether all this postponement of the trial and packing of the evidence, and previous negotiations with the prisoner, does not evince a consciousness

that the earl could, if he so pleased, have made disclosures prejudicial to the king's credit; or whether such passages may not be explained by the customs of the times in such matters, by the peculiar fondness of James for searching out causes and trying conclusions, and by his anxiety to show that his justice could reach the highest head in the land, coupled with his reluctance to proceed rigorously against an old favourite, with whom he was perhaps not very grievously, and certainly not implacably, offended. That he did entertain serious apprehensions of what Somerset might say is beyond a doubt. Independently of the testimony of Weldon—now confirmed—as to his restlessness pending the trial, we collect that the instructions given privately to Bacon by the king were, to prevent him from becoming *desperate*, and to persuade him that his fair treatment in the Tower, and the lenient handling of his case before the peers, were the result of his Majesty's intercession; while Bacon suggests that when he is actually on his trial, he should be reminded that any attempt to *tax* the king would be followed by his being immediately removed from the bar, and deprived of his chance of pardon [6]. The question is, not whether James was alarmed at Somerset's menaces—for that is clear enough—but whether what he feared was the publication of some great and horrible state-secret, or merely such a general exposure as six years' unreserved intimacy would enable any favourite to make, and James, least of all monarchs, was of a character to sustain. On the whole, we are inclined to think the latter supposition the less improbable.

The opinions of contemporaries, and of older writers, especially of the Secret Histories, were certainly the other way. But their suspicions pointed in a direction which we know to be false. It was then rumoured that prince Henry was carried off by poison, administered by Somerset, with the connivance of James. We

[6] It is clear that Somerset did at last go to trial without giving any promise whatever of good behaviour, and that the king and his advisers were still in suspense as to his course. So that it might be inferred that James's dread of what Somerset could disclose, was less than his dread of what the public would say if he were not tried at all. Our readers are probably aware that the supposed secret has been alluded to by Bacon in an expostulatory letter which he wrote to Coke when the latter was in disgrace after the trial. Here follow the mysterious words: "This crime was second to none but the powder-plot. That would have blown up all at one blow, a merciful cruelty: this would have done the same by degrees, a lingering but sure way: one by one might be called out till all opposers had been removed. Besides, that other plot was scandalous to Rome, making popery odious in the sight of the whole world; this had been scandalous to the truth of the whole Gospel; and since the first nullity to this instant, when justice hath her hands bound, the Devil could not have invented a more mischievous practice to our State and Church than this hath been, and is like to be. God avert the evil!" These words to us are quite hieroglyphics. The letter too implies that Coke knew what the crime was, and had erred in alluding to it. But Coke's allusion is known to have been to the murder of Prince Henry; which is also known to be a groundless story.

happen to have the best evidence possible in such a case that he died of a malignant fever, but it is not very consolatory to the student of history to observe that if we had not, fortunately, got this conclusive authority, we should have been inevitably led to an opposite determination, by an accumulation of testimony on the other side. So strange is the concurrence of evidence, both direct and indirect, to this point, and so conveniently would the hypothesis explain much of what we have now been so unsatisfactorily discussing, that we have at times been tempted to suppose that Somerset and his miserable quacksalvers, who were clearly quite ignorant of the power of poisons, had perhaps been tampering, though ineffectually, with the prince's life; that the will was theirs, though the deed was not; and that they at last attributed to their spells and powders a death which came by the visitation of God. But we cannot discover any considerations to explain such an atrocious attempt. Though no congeniality of temper or habit made the young prince a companion for his father, yet no serious quarrel between them is related, and it is hardly credible that we should be without record of any such differences as would make a proverbially kind-hearted monarch devise the murder of his eldest son. And if Henry had no high place in his father's every-day affections, yet this very circumstance would remove the rivalry and disarm the jealousy of the favourite. Birch showed great judgment in selecting the biography of this young prince as a subject for his pen, for he was a very remarkable person, and perhaps even the death of prince Arthur, a century before him, had hardly more effect than his on the fortunes of the English people and the English Church. But though he showed abundant indications of his spirit, yet there is not evidence that he formed any party, or that any party was formed against him, or that he raised any enemies of such power and malice as to bring about his destruction.

Some writers, in relating the particulars of this catastrophe, without precisely denying the consent of Somerset to the murder, have insinuated their belief, that the arrest and prosecution of the Earl were owing mainly to court factions and intrigues; that he had disgusted, by the haughtiness of his demeanour, a powerful party, who eagerly seized this opportunity of effecting his ruin; and that the king was no ways unwilling to be rid of an old favourite, and make room for a new one. Dr. Lingard evidently inclines to such an opinion, and Bishop Goodman expresses it without hesitation. It is evident, too, that some such conclusion was commonly accepted at the time. When the first criminal suffered, who was Weston, five gentlemen rode up to the gallows, and endeavoured to draw from him, in his last moments, an

avowal of the truth or falsehood of the charge; a proceeding which was afterwards punished as an "attempt to slander the king's justice." It may be noticed too, that all accounts of the discovery of the murder concur in giving the chief credit of it to Winwood, a bitter enemy of Somerset's. And it is clear, from Bacon's Correspondence, that Buckingham was actively interfering in the matter, either by conveying the king's wishes, or suggesting his own; an influence which Somerset himself alludes to with obvious apprehension, in the least obscure part of his famous letter to the king. It would be absurd to deny that much of the zeal displayed in these transactions, arose from other motives than a love of justice, but we hardly think that any desire to be rid of a discarded favourite, can be shown to have had much influence upon James. The Secret Histories, with all their scandal, do not tell us precisely when the king first saw Buckingham, or when Somerset's splendour was first observed to wane. But it is clear, that even after Buckingham's establishment in the royal favour, Somerset had still considerable power and place, nor do we think it unlikely that James would willingly have kept them both about him. It is even alleged, though on no good authority, that he did desire his favourites to be good friends to each other, but that Somerset repelled the advances which Villiers made[7]. There is, however, quite enough in the king's conduct at the trial, to show that Somerset had not lost favour as well as credit. Though James perhaps was less scrupulous on these points than Henry the Eighth, and might not have thought it the necessary duty of a Christian man to kill one favourite before he took another; yet if his friendship had been altogether gone, there would have been no reason why he should step out of his path to save him from a just death, or restore him his forfeit inheritance. It is now well known too, that at a later period of his life, he made overtures towards reinstating him completely at court, and superseding Buckingham in his favour.

The reader has probably, by this time, looked long enough at this atrocious crime, and he will readily conceive what a boundless source of libel and scandal it afterwards proved. The proceedings of the divorce, the complication of the plot, the details of the crime, the accident of the discovery, all combined to make it one of the most popular illustrations of God's revenge against Murther; while the mystery hanging over it, and implicating the king's own person, supplied the Puritans and Republicans with a never-failing topic against courts and sovereigns. Never was a

[7] Such is Weldon's statement, but it is clear from his narrative of this catastrophe that he knew little about the particulars.

murder attended with circumstances so extraordinary, or so marvellously attractive to the vulgar. For five months, seven persons were incessantly engaged in poisoning one man. They were not adepts in toxicology it is clear, yet their efforts were reasonably vigorous. They gave him big spiders, cantharides, white arsenic, mercury sublimate, and *rosalgar*. These they administered uninterruptedly—Weston in his daily food, the Countess in tarts and jellies, which she sent from her own house. One day a servant was entrusted with a great pie to take down to the Tower. With the irrepressible instinct of his class, the wretch stuck his thumb through the crust, and sucked it. The treat cost him his nails, but saved him his life. At the examinations, Coke, who was bullying every body, came in turn to him; "And you too had a hand in this poisoning business," said he; "If it please you, my Lord," replied the fellow, "I only had a finger, and for that I lost my nails and my hair!" The answer was so decisive that he was no more troubled. The extraordinary aspect of the facts alleged for the prosecution, that a man should be gorged with venom for twenty weeks, and live, did not escape the searching eye of Bacon in conducting the case. He thought it necessary to offer some explanation. He said that the first poisons being ineffectual, became antidotes; that as they did not kill, they saved; and rendered the body, like that of Mithridates, impervious to all that were subsequently administered; an argument which, perhaps, in the days of homœopathy, will not be considered altogether vain. After all, Franklin declared on his trial, that they *could not* poison Overbury, and that he was smothered.

King James's contemporaries might have engaged themselves in chronicling more important matters than such tales as these. One of the earliest of the Secret Histories, that bearing the name of Fulke Greville, does purport to be a memorial of the Condition of the State of England, and the Relation it had to other Provinces, but its contents display not the slightest warrant for this promising title. There was impending at this period a great change in the relations of the states of Europe to each other. A century had elapsed since Ferdinand the Catholic, profiting by the lessons of his crafty father, John of Aragon, had substituted accredited and formal representatives at foreign courts, for the secret agents employed by Louis XI., and had thus laid the foundation of that regular diplomatic intercourse between states, which becomes a distinguishing feature in history, immediately after the middle ages. But though embassies abounded in the sixteenth century, yet international politics did not at once make any great advance. States had not yet fully learnt to act in

concert. And it may, we think, be doubted, whether the opponents of the Austro-Spanish, and Spanish monarchies, under Charles V. and Philip II., possessed clear ideas concerning a balance of power, or whether they were actuated by the same motives which guided the adversaries of the Emperor Ferdinand II. Still less do we think it can be shown that the supremacy of Spain was wrested from her, like that of Austria and France subsequently, by any external powers combined for that purpose. Philip was not arrested, like Ferdinand or Louis XIV., in a victorious career. Spain had already, in the middle of the sixteenth century, put the coping-stone to the huge fabric of her empire, and it soon began to crumble of itself. A handful of her subjects revolted against her oppressive rule, and revolted successfully, owing to the aid which the provoked and angry powers of England and France were ready to bestow, though they could attempt nothing of themselves. The vain efforts of Spain against these intrepid rebels exposed her weakness, but can hardly be said to have caused it. It could not have checked the growth of her power, for it had already finished growing. Her rapid decline has always been considered an historical problem, though one which, we think, it would not be very difficult to solve. But the causes were internal. The mischief was visible even under Philip II.[8], and at the accession of Philip IV., forty years before the peace of the Pyrenees, had already been done. And so completely was this fact recognized, that one of the first acts of Olivarez, was to collect from the magistracy of each district of the country, a report of affairs in their particular locality, accompanied by such explanations of the general decline, and such suggestions for future improvement, as they might feel able to offer.

The change that was now impending was brought about by the famous Thirty Years' War, of which James saw the commencement, and might perhaps have accelerated the issue. In this desperate struggle the states of Europe learnt first the advantage of acting in concert, a lesson which became the more important, as the great game of war was played with more pieces than before. Europe was no longer represented by "the two crowns." Holland had gained, Portugal regained, an independent existence, and the powers of the North were now first brought into action.

[8] A remarkable address from Cortes to Philip in 1594, after lamenting the decay of trade and manufactures, says, "Lo cual hace que no haya ciudad de las principales destos réinos ni lugar ninguno de donde no falte notable vecindad, como se echa bien de ver en la muchedumbre de casas que estan cerradas y despobladas, y en la baja que han dado los arrendamientos de las pocas que se arrendanan y habitan." Memoirs of the Royal Spanish Academy of History, vi. 304.

The point about which these new allies were rallied, was at first nominally that of religion, and we think, with more sincerity on the Papist than on the Protestant side, but the contest quickly assumed its aspect of a struggle strictly for the balance of power, and religious wars were never seen again in Europe. At the end of the century Louis XIV. attempted to disperse the allies, and advance his own interests, by making it a war of religion, but in vain [9].

Now let us see if we can briefly supply what King James's scandal-monger has omitted, and show something of the state of England, and the relation it had to other provinces in these times. Holland was the spot to which all eyes were turned. The struggle there was rapidly approaching a termination, and it was clear that the result would leave a new state, capable hereafter of being an unpleasant enemy, or a serviceable ally. Their successful stand had been owing to England and France, the first of which sympathized with them as Protestants, the last as rebels. But from the beginning the co-operation of France had been more cordial and more generous, and excited warmer feelings of gratitude amongst the people. The demeanour of Elizabeth had been both uncertain and ungracious, and James, with a sad lack of king-craft, made matters worse than they were before. In his heart he thought the cause of the Dutch a bad one, and that they were unjustifiably resisting their rightful sovereign. And this he disclosed so clearly that it was never forgotten. The disposition of the English people generally towards the Dutch appears to have been good, though arising more perhaps from religious sympathies, than those political considerations which should have been obvious to both states. It was not very permanently affected even by the atrocious massacre of Amboyna. The Dutch, however, did not return the friendship. In their eyes France had been their truest friend. This power they had not yet learnt to fear, while they regarded us with a dislike and suspicion, which the natural rivalship of commerce continually exasperated. In 1668, only four years before Louis marched his army to the gates of Amsterdam, De Witt told Temple that he could not help hesitating at the idea that Holland should forsake France, her ancient and faithful ally, and league with England, her inveterate foe. It was not till after the peace of Nimeguen, and the accession of William, that the Dutch and English understood their real interests, and contracted that alliance which remained for near a century unbroken.

If there was any person in these times who regarded the inter-

[9] See a letter of Shrewsbury to Portland, Shrewsbury Correspondence, p. 160; and another of A. Stanhope's in Lord Mahon's Spain under Charles II., p. 159.

national relations of Europe with any thing like the judgment of after generations, it may be said to have been Henry the Fourth. Yet he seems to have confined his view chiefly to France and Spain, and to have considered other kingdoms merely as affecting the preponderance of one or other of the two crowns. These he thought were the two scales. If one went down, the other must necessarily go up; and therefore he aimed at the aggrandizement of his own country through the depression of the house of Austria. But nothing can be more certain than that, at the period of his mighty preparations for this purpose, Europe was menaced with no danger whatever from this quarter. Austria and Spain were equally feeble: their united powers were hardly sufficient to rule the dependencies of either. Henry, however, did pretend to fear the overgrowth of Spain; and he directed Sully to frighten James with the prospect of a universal monarchy to be centred in that sinking house. And either he or his minister anticipated the idea of effectually combining one half of Europe in the cause of Protestantism, and of enlisting in the fight the hitherto secluded powers of Old Scandinavia. The republics of Switzerland and Holland; that of Venice, which at this period was on the very point of openly embracing the reformed faith; the Protestant princes of the empire; and the kingdom of Great Britain;—these were the allies which Henry IV. purposed to join to the whole strength of France, for the execution of his projects. What these projects were, or in what they would have resulted, it may be difficult to say. The king probably looked at nothing but the debasement of the Austrian house. He is reported to have been quite ignorant himself of the geography, history, and constitutions of other countries, and, therefore, unlikely to have devised any such scheme as that famous plan of dividing all Europe anew into fifteen states[1]. It signifies little who was the author of this extraordinary conception; but it is remarkable, as showing how comprehensively politics must have been viewed before any such idea could have been arrived at, as the reorganization of the continent, and also as indicating what centres of union were thought fittest for the new kingdoms. Towards England, the feeling of France was tolerably friendly, and it was reciprocated. The English people respected Henry as the champion of the reformed faith; a title which he affected long after

[1] See it in Sully, Œcon. Roy. c. xix. and xx. There were to be five hereditary monarchies; France, Spain, Great Britain, Sweden, and Lombardy: six elective monarchies, the Papacy, the Empire, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, and Denmark, and four republics, Holland, Switzerland, Venice, and the Italian states. The deputies of these fifteen states were to form a general council for Europe. Savoy, as a matter of course, had got a kingdom in the scramble, and was to rule over Lombardy. Austria, Russia, and Prussia are nowhere.

joining the opposite communion. They sympathized with him as the enemy of Spain, the ally of Holland, and the friend of their late queen. Nor do we doubt but they would willingly have fought under his banner, if James had been willing, and if a religious aspect had been given to the war. In fact, France at this time stood well in the eyes of Europe, and was generally considered as the protector of the oppressed, or, in other words, of the Protestants,—a character which, notwithstanding her persecutions at home, she contrived to assume in the Thirty Years' War, and to sustain at the peace of Westphalia. Louis XIV., when he commenced his subsequent designs against Germany and Holland,—designs more formidable than any entertained by Spain,—found no little advantage in this character. It disarmed the suspicion of the Dutch, and gave him a party in the very heart of the Empire.

Spain, though, as we have before observed, it had ceased to be an object of serious dread to the people, was still regarded with undiminished hate. The failure of the Spanish expeditions against this country, and the effectual resistance of the Dutch, revealed the weakness of Philip's monarchy; while the successful reprisals of Elizabeth had taught the English to look on a Spanish war as a source of boundless profit. It was therefore against the will of many that the treaty with Philip was concluded at the commencement of this reign. But to Spain it was absolutely necessary. This power, still nominally possessing the supremacy of Europe, was compelled to purchase peace from a state so much below it in resources and extent. "One Spaniard told us," says Bishop Goodman, "that he himself had paid three thousand pounds to one man for furthering the peace." The chief ground of the national aversion to Spain was no doubt its identification with the cause of the Papists. In the late reign, the Roman Catholic party and the Spanish party were one and the same thing. The armada was believed by the vulgar to have been fitted out at least as much for the conversion as the conquest of the island; and the unsightly instruments of torture found on board were exhibited as engines to be employed for the same purpose as the fires of Queen Mary. Such conclusions as these directed full against Spain the machine by which popular feelings were then mainly moved. France was not equally liable to the attack: for though Henry called himself a Papist, he was still in league with all the Protestant powers; and a large portion of his subjects were open and courageous professors of the reformed faith. Yet it is certain, for all this, that throughout these times a greater influence was exerted on the mind of the English nation by Spain than by France. It was the Spanish literature, with its affectation, its conceits, and its obscurity, which gave the tone

to ours; a result perhaps partly owing to the fortunate enterprises of our mariners, and partly to the prepossessions of James and the connexions of the court.

The conduct and temper of James the First materially affected the position of England amongst the other powers of Europe. At the opening of that new intercourse between states, which followed upon their general consolidation after the middle ages, the pride of Henry VIII., and the ambition of Wolsey, had given considerable prominence to this island. "There was no treaty," says Herbert, "and almost conventicle in Christendom, in which Henry had not his particular interest." He retired, however, about the middle of his reign, *a scena in secreta;* to enjoy that contemplative tranquillity prescribed by ancient philosophy for the close of a public life; to guard more parentally and apply more judiciously the resources of his people; and to relieve the pomp of royal duties by the calm quietude of domestic harmony. The brief and troubled reign of his feeble successors left them but little influence on continental politics, and the loss of Calais seemed to mark the determination of England's foreign power. The vigorous mind and sagacious ministry of Elizabeth again raised her country in the scale of nations, and both England and Holland soon gained that respect which is always commanded by successful resistance to superior strength. The queen's intervention was sought and obtained by the most powerful belligerents, and though her aid was scantily measured and ungraciously bestowed, yet its effect was decisive, and her position was little less commanding than that of her father. All this James lost. With opportunities far greater than that of his predecessor, he did not even retain the ground she had won, either with his allies or with his subjects. Unfortunately his predilections ran exactly counter to those of his people, and this was an age when the predilection of a sovereign had some weight in his council. He regarded the Dutch with an aversion which seems to have become hereditary in his family, and he looked up to Spain with the most profound respect. In James's eye the greatest of beings was a king, and the greatest of kings was the king of Spain. Philip was the incarnation of kingship. The speculative absolutism of James turned with veneration to a monarch of such vast dominions and such oriental state, whose uncontrolled power was not more owing to divine right than to the willing loyalty of his devoted subjects. No sooner was he on the throne of Britain than he anticipated the requisitions of Spain, and disclosed his desire for peace. It is impossible to blame his abstract preference of peace to war, but had he carried himself with greater dignity, he might have reigned in peace all his days,

and yet retained the respect of France, and commanded the gratitude of Holland.

England thus played no part worth mention in that protracted struggle, which changed entirely the relations of European states; and the great treaty of Westphalia, the base of the modern system of European politics, was settled without her voice. Nor did she quickly reappear on the stage in her proper character. Incidental and isolated actions, it is true, showed that the national spirit was still the same. At the battle of the Dunes, Morgan's English regiments gave Turenne the victory over Condé, and decided the forty years' quarrel between France and Spain. At the battle of Estremos the English troops defeated Don John of Austria, and secured the house of Braganza on the throne of Portugal [2]. But neither Cromwell nor his legitimate successors advanced England to her place. Thirty years later, when the designs of Louis XIV. had thrown all Europe into combination, it is remarkable how little effect was at first produced by the accession of this country to the league. The abdication of James and the recognition of William, deprived Louis of the only alliance he could possibly hope for, and threw into the scale against him the only first-rate power that remained. Men thought that the game was up. Bets were laid that William would be in Paris before Christmas. Yet the events of the campaigns were very little changed. The Buffs beat the French guards, and the Royal Irish took Namur, but on the whole the superiority of Louis was as decided as before. He never changed his tone or his position. He dictated the same terms with the same haughtiness; and after seven years' fighting he hardly lost ground. Louis at Ryswic was much the same person as Louis at Nimeguen. At each of these treaties he made nearly the same demands, and obtained the same concessions, and in the days of his after humiliations, he was almost as eager to refer to one as to the other for the preliminaries of a new arrangement. It was Marlborough that did all for us. The twenty years between 1690 and 1710, effected almost as great a change in our position as a similar interval has ever done for Spain.

To say that James was lightly esteemed by contemporary sovereigns is probably correct. Yet such statement does not necessarily imply any great censure. He might be as much above as below them. Henry IV. had formed his estimate of James's character before he succeeded to the British throne, and it seems from Sully's Memoirs that he expected to have little

[2] "*La victoria se debio,*" says a Spanish historian, "*á la infantería Inglesa.*" Is such a sentence as this to be found in Toreno?

difficulty in bending him to his purposes. In this, at all events, he was disappointed. And we think that the conduct of James in his negotiations with Henry is not altogether to be blamed. At the age of fifty-eight, on a trifling pretext, and probably with no more definite motive than a wish to abase his rival, Henry was prepared to plunge all Europe into war. James refused him any cordial co-operation. It may be too much to say that he foresaw that the balance of power would hereafter be liable to more disturbance from France than from Spain, and that he was loth to aid in the aggrandizement of a formidable foe. Yet it required no great stretch of sagacity to discern that Henry's allies were always expected to give more than they got, and that the intended expedition promised little benefit to Europe, and less to England. The mistakes of James were oftener *in modo* than *in re*. The craft on which he so peculiarly prided himself was the point of his chief deficiency. If he preferred peace, it was with the air of a man afraid of war. He was overreached in every negotiation. If he wanted any thing, he disclosed his eagerness so precipitately, that the price of the commodity was sure to be raised. If others wanted any thing, they contrived to make the proposal come from him, and managed to be bribed into their own interests. With his parliament he was equally unfortunate. They knew that his purse was empty, and his purpose infirm; and they played with his necessities, and laughed at his rage.

His sagacity was at fault even in forming advantageous matches for his children, a business not requiring, nor often employing, a very high order of intellect. The heir apparent to the crown of Great Britain could only get a wife after much demur, and on hard conditions. His daughter's marriage—a marriage which was to furnish England with her sovereigns in after ages—was popular for the sole reason that the bridegroom was a Protestant[3]. In its immediate results a most unhappy match it proved, though it is absurd to say that it had any share in bringing on the Thirty Years' War. The unsettled state of ecclesiastical matters in the empire, and the disputes arising

[3] D'Ewes remarks in his gossiping way, that it was observed that the Palsgrave was of the oldest blood in Europe excepting the Capets, which is nearly true. The Palatinate and Bavaria between them were the only representatives of the old imperial Duchies. Swabia and Franconia died with the Hohenstauffens. Brandenburg and Saxony were transferred to new houses in the fifteenth century, and Bohemia was merged in Austria. Of this old blood of the Palsgraves was the mother of the reigning house of England. If older blood could be found it was that of the father. The Brunswick family were the lineal representatives of Henry the Lion, the old deposed Duke of Saxony, heir of the D'Estes and representative of the Guelfs. From these two most ancient stocks of father and mother springs our present royal line.

daily in such affairs from the incompleteness of former treaties and transactions, rendered it quite certain that war must occur before the political and ecclesiastical rights of the multifarious Germanic powers could be arranged. Accident produced the first explosion in Bohemia, and when the sword was once drawn, perhaps a confidence in his father-in-law's aid induced the unlucky Palatine to accept a more prominent position in the tumult than he would otherwise have dreamt of. This aid was not forthcoming; not, at least, to such extent as was anticipated, and the backwardness of James in this matter is one of the points in his conduct most frequently attacked. His son-in-law, without his advice, had accepted a crown with an unjust title, and most precarious tenure. He was forced to relinquish it to its former possessor, who proceeded in retaliation to amerce him also of his hereditary dominions. That James was bound to aid him in his aggressions is not often pretended, but even Bolingbroke, amongst others, contends that he should have been effectually supported in defence of his patrimony—that he should have been screened from just punishment, if not abetted in wrong. The excitement of the English people was outrageous. They insisted that Britain, without the co-operation of France, should recover a district in Germany from the combined powers of Austria and Spain, commanded by Spinola. A barrister was overheard to say that he was glad "Goodman Palsgrave and his good wife" (Frederick and Elizabeth) had been driven from Prague. The remark was pronounced a treasonable offence against the nation. The House of Commons decreed that the culprit should be carried on horseback, with his face to the horse's tail, to the pillory, that he should there stand three several times, and that he should pay a fine of a thousand pounds. On legal grounds an appeal was made; and the case was transferred to the lords. The Upper House corrected the judgment of the lower, and ordered that the criminal should stand three times in the pillory, should be degraded from the estate of a gentleman, be declared infamous, be whipped from Westminster to the Fleet, be fined five thousand pounds, and be imprisoned for life.

To understand these times aright, it is necessary to keep constantly in view, without a moment's oversight, one particular fact. The bulk of the middle classes hated Popery more than they feared the devil, or loved their money, or cared for themselves. This passion overwhelmed every other, even that of self-interest. The ruin of the Romish worship was an object compared with which the security of their own was insignificant. They spurned indulgences extended to Papists, and hugged persecutions which Papists shared. Bolingbroke says that

James made a great mistake in not acting decisively against the Roman Catholics at his accession, and throwing himself at once into the arms of the opposite party. There can be no doubt but this was the way to win. If the king had opened parliament by burning four papists in Palace-Yard, he might have browbeaten Yelverton, and imprisoned Digges, and obtained money enough to surfeit all Scotland. Coupled with penalties against recusants, proclamations might have been issued without remonstrance, and impositions levied without a murmur. For a marriage of his son with a princess of Brandenburgh, James might have taken half the plate in the kingdom. And if Prince Henry had lived to reign, and had answered the expectations of his people; if he had abolished the surplice and seized the chapter-lands; if he had joined hands with Gustavus Adolphus, and marched twenty thousand men into Pomerania, we see no reason for doubting that he might have rivalled the authority as well as the renown of Louis XIV.

Burnet somewhere makes a remark, that all the periodical outbreaks against the Roman Catholics were owing to the horror with which the nation had been inspired by the cruelties under Mary, and Mr. Hallam has implied his concurrence in the observation. No doubt these traditional stories were told with effect, but other circumstances must have conspired to keep these feelings in such undiminished force. The puritanical doctrines, which many now openly professed, and perhaps more preferred, prescribed the most active hostility to the tenets of Rome, and from this source flowed most of the opposition in the House of Commons[4]. And though the lower and less educated people had welcomed the reformation less willingly, and lingered amongst the ancient forms more longingly than those of better understanding; yet they had now for many years been taught to associate this faith with all that was wicked and cruel. "The common people," says Goodman, "did hate them above measure, for they must ever have an object to their hate. Heretofore the Welsh, the Scot,

[4] A nonconformist writer observes, "In the judgment of the Puritans, the theological errors of the Papists were fatal to salvation, and their opinions with regard to the authority of the Pope in relation to this kingdom, were viewed as equally subversive of its ecclesiastical and civil freedom. Their own preferences on the contrary were at least home-bred and English." . . . . . "The unanimity (in passing laws against Papists) we may hope was more apparent than real. It may have arisen in part from a consciousness that what was harsh in the letter of the statute would become tempered in the administration of it, and there was an evident fitness in such proceedings to express the national repugnance to the proposed alliance with Spain." Vaughan's Memorials of the Stuart Dynasty, i. 149, 273. After this the Roman Catholics may fairly demand an historian. We may observe, however, in passing, that (besides Dr. Lingard's work) there are a number of small Popish histories of England for schools and children, which the reader may see enumerated in any catalogue of Dolman's, and to which we may some day allude further.

or the Spaniard, and the French upon occasion; but now in these later times only the Papists." When Bacon wanted to characterize the poisoning of Overbury, he called it a *Popish* crime. When the prisons were opened at a jubilee, those confined for murder and Popery were exempted from the general release. And it cannot be denied that such incidents as the Gunpowder Treason and the assassination of Henry IV. were not ill calculated to illustrate such teaching, and confirm the impressions produced by it.

If by designs against the people be meant a deliberate scheme to extend the prerogative at the expense of the acknowledged rights of the subject, such designs are not to be attributed to James. His idea of a king was formed on the definition of *Rex* given by civilians. Whatever he saw wrong he thought himself called on to amend. That there were no laws against extravagance and folly was the greater reason, in his eyes, why he should act without them. His proclamations were illegal; but they were illegal proclamations against vice. The crown cannot interfere with the elections; but this James never considered. He thought himself bound by his station to give good advice to his subjects; and he issued an order that they should choose members of parliament neither bankrupts nor outlaws, but good men from their own country [5]. He wanted to unite England with Scotland and to leave them at peace; but he imagined that both these events were attached to his person, and not determinable elsewhere. From beginning to end he was wretchedly deficient in all the points of his study and his pride. His scholastic learning taught him neither international law nor constitutional history. His philosophy never enabled him to understand the most comprehensible of people. His king-craft failed him in the commonest negotiation. His astuteness was all against himself. His best contrivances issued in gaining him credit for mischief which he never intended, and in misrepresenting good which he really meant. With much learning and some sagaciousness, he displayed the manners of an idiot, and fell into the blunders of a dunce. With great kindness, good intentions, and large professions, he injured his kingdom and provoked his subjects; he was bullied and plundered during his life, and left an ill-favoured name behind him.

[5] The proclamation touching the summons of the first Parliament, for which James is so much blamed, was drawn up and revised by Ellesmere and Chief Justice Popham. See the Egerton Papers, p. 386. One of the heads directs the sheriff not to summon any burgess for any borough "that is utterly ruynated and decayed." There is also in these papers a curious memorandum of an answer from the heads of houses of Cambridge, concerning the admission of Scottish students to fellowships, &c. All the blame of the refusal is thrown on the fellows, who "will be adverse and backward to any such good purpose as this, because whatsoever is this way to be allowed must of necessity be defalked from them."

ART. V.—1. *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland; being an Inquiry into the Liturgical System of the Cathedral and Collegiate Foundations of the Anglican Communion. By the Rev.* JOHN JEBB, *A.M., Rector of Peterstow.* London: John W. Parker.

2. *Three Lectures on the Cathedral Service of the Church of England. By the Rev.* JOHN JEBB, *A.M.*

3. *An Apology for the Cathedral Service.* London: John Bohn.

4. *The English Cathedral Service.* London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

5. *The Booke of Common Praier noted. By* JOHN MERBECKE. London: William Pickering.

6. *The whole Psalter, with the Gregorian Tones adapted to the several Psalms.* Oxford: Parker.

7. *Gregorian and other Ecclesiastical Chants adapted to the Psalter and Canticles, &c.* London: James Burns.

8. *Introits; or Collect Hymns adapted to the Stated Services of the Church of England. By* ABNER W. BROWN, *A.B., Vicar of Pytchley.* London: Rivingtons.

No one, we conceive, is satisfied with the state of Church music. Viewed in a mere artistical light, it is commonly either bad in itself; or, if not abstractedly bad, inappropriate; or, if suitable in style, badly performed. Viewed in a higher light, as something offered to God, as the supposed dedication of certain powers, as the devotional and solemn use of a great gift, we are apt to be pained by want of a devotional and holy tone either in the music itself, or in the singers. In short, whether viewed artistically or religiously, the state of our Church music provokes our grief or our censure, being either debased in style, theatrical, and undevotional, or drawled over, or hurried over, or sung mechanically, or bombastically by a self-complacent "choir." That which is capable in the highest degree of quickening, sustaining, deepening, or elevating religious feeling, which, by its most penetrating influences can either rouse the soul, or soothe or melt it, is most times a disappointment or an annoyance. We either wince, or are weary; we are either indifferent, or distressed. It is the exception to be satisfied, to feel that music has done its work as a consecrated instrument, that it has been duly used as a

help to godliness, that its utmost powers have been piously developed, that our natural notions of its impressiveness have been fulfilled, that our sober dreams of its capacities as a spiritual agency have been realized. We are bold enough to say, that in the majority of cathedrals, where of course we look for the nearest approach to perfection on this matter, the music is positively bad; that is, the whole service is bad; there is either bad music, or unskilful singing, or visible slovenliness, marked and open irreverence in those that take part in the service. And if cathedrals are in such a state, we can hardly be surprised at the wretchedness of parochial music; a pilgrimage through parish churches would be a pilgrimage indeed to acute and sensitive ears and souls.

And, what is the worst feature of the case, as regards parochial music, it does not come from the people; it is not in any sense congregational; it is something exclusively appropriated to a few, peculiar to the gallery; and when we speak of desiring congregational singing, or lament the want of it, we do not understand the well-meant, but excruciating and inconsiderate efforts of those to whom God has denied the gift of ear or voice, or both; as it is, however, the congregation does but listen and look on; and thus there is a notion of exhibition or display in the whole concern, as though the two parties, the congregation and the choir, occupied the relative position of "audience" and "performers." "The choir," in most cases, is an exalted body, pewed up, and curtained round, a small oligarchy, a distinct order, not to be meddled with, who "do" the music. Though we desire to retain "choirs," that is, a body of well-trained persons duly qualified to lead, not to represent or supersede, the musical part of the congregation, yet as long as they are separated in position from the main body of the congregation, and raised like ball-room musicians into an orchestra by themselves, so long shall we have to complain of the utterly uncongregational character of our parochial music; and the more it loses its congregational character, the more it becomes a merely professional affair, the less will it partake of that style which is suited to parochial service.

And yet, while so seldom satisfied, so often wearied or distressed, we are ever expecting great things from the powers of music; we all turn to it in the hope that it will give warmth, life, variety, spirit to our service, and help to bring back our wandering thoughts, and lessen our weariness or our coldness in the acts of prayer and praise. We have all our ideal of the power of our Liturgy, as musically expressed. Those on whom the privilege of feeling music has been bestowed, have the liveliest, we

might say the most enthusiastic notions of its capabilities as an aid to devotion in its sublimest exercise. We raise before our imagination some service, as it might be in a cathedral, where a multitude of fervent and tuneful worshippers tossed, as it were, in holy rivalry the waves of praise from side to side; nay, even the present weak and emaciated state of cathedral service suggests our ideal, and gives a glimpse of possible excellence, were the cathedral system faithfully, vigorously, energetically worked out, and the ample endowments turned to the best account.

And while we have imaginary pictures of the grandeur of our musical Liturgy before our minds, we can see no reason why they should continue to be but dreams and holy fancies. While our hearts quite burn within us, as we contemplate the effectiveness of a service so performed, a Liturgy so illustrated and expressed, we can see no reason why the actual state of Church music should be so very far behind the ideal. Is it impossible ever to obtain one or two hundred devout persons skilled in singing to take part in the cathedral service? Or, taking a lower standard of hope, is it impossible to see, what has been seen in the Chapel Royal, "when the choir," we quote from the pamphlet entitled "The English Cathedral Service," at the head of our article, "consisted of twenty-four chaplains, thirty-two lay clerks, and twelve boys, all of whom were required to be well skilled in music, clear-voiced, and the men to be sufficient in organ-playing?"

Now, as music must be ever reckoned among the mysteries of the world, the mysteries of the spiritual world, coming we know not whence, and acting we know not how, so does it seem the duty of the Church, its proper work and office, as a body designed to incorporate into itself all influences capable of good, to develope, as far as may be, such a mystical power, to use an influence, so subtle, so unsearchable, so strong, so quick in operation. We can never, indeed, understand or analyze the action of this mystery; it seems so direct an agent, and yet unseen, penetrating like the wind, creeping and piercing into the very innermost heart, making, with its invisible touch, the whole system to vibrate. And while thus so forcibly working on some men, it is absolutely nothing to others; it is but empty, unmeaning sound; the sweetest air is no more than the rustling of dry leaves; while we see one set of men melted in a moment, or excited or depressed, we see another set of men, whose ears receive the same sounds, and yet the sounds have neither speech nor language, raise no emotions, pass over them without effect; their blood runs as evenly as before; their nerves are not touched; their whole system is wholly unconscious of the presence of an

influence so strong in others, and they are themselves wholly unable to understand what others say of it.

But as the greater part of men are so strongly affected by the power of music, it would seem more peculiarly the duty of the Church to use such a mystery for good, because it is capable of abuse; it can be desecrated as well as consecrated; it can speak with an evil tongue as well as with a divine; it can act as a sensual, as well as a devotional stimulant; it can sweeten sin, or melt the soul and deepen its remorse; it can stir up the flame of carnal passion, or provoke to prayer. It is little likely that Satan should have set such an influence at nought; he knows too well its value as a means to *excitement*. How many scenes of worldly pleasure would pall, would grow insipid, flat, and wearisome, if there were not something floating in the air, if there were not music to quicken the pleasure-seeker's flagging pulse, to enliven, to inspirit, to brighten with artificial fire, to infuse its indescribable fascination! We must remember how it is said, "The harp, and the viol, the tabret and pipe, are in their feasts; but they regard not the work of the Lord." The world has not changed. What would be theatres, all manner of spectacles, ball-rooms, the infamous ballet, or, in lower life, the alehouse and its revels, if they were without sound, if they were scenes of mute dissipation, if the half-dressed ballet-dancer went through her shameless contortions of form without any music to stir the blood, by its excitement to drive off reflection, and to make the vicious entertainment more pleasurable by the addition of its magical influence?

It is, then, hardly left to the Church to choose whether or not she will employ this agency, whether she will leave it unused or not. If she has wisdom as well as faith, she must see that unless she would contend with the world at a disadvantage, she must try to use music as a persuasive to devotion and prayer. As the tabret, and the harp, and the viol are in the feasts of the world, giving the most forcible expression to worldly feeling, and making "the mystery of iniquity" work more successfully; so must the Church, that she may give the most forcible expression to religious feeling, cry out, like David, "Take the psalm, bring hither the tabret; the merry harp with the lute!"

How exquisitely has Hooker, as quoted by the author of the "English Cathedral," spoken of the power of music, when he says, "Harmony delighteth all ages, and beseemeth all states. It is as seasonable in grief as in joy, as decent when added unto things of greatest weight and solemnity as in cheerful and becoming festivity. . . . . So that even if we lay aside the consideration of ditty or matter, the very harmony of sounds, being framed

in due sort, and carried from the ear to the spiritual faculties of our souls, is by a native puissance and efficacy greatly available to bring to a perfect temper whatsoever is there troubled; apt as well to quicken as to allay the spirit; sovereign against melancholy and despair; forcible to draw forth tears of devotion; able both to move and moderate all affections. Therefore doth the Church, at this present day, retain it as an ornament to God's service and a help to our devotion.

"In Church music, wanton, light, or unsuitable melody, such as only pleaseth the ear, and serveth not the matter that goeth with it, doth rather blemish and disgrace what we do, than add either beauty or furtherance to it. On the other hand, such faults prevented, music, when fitly suited with matter sounding to the praise of God, is in truth most admirable, and doth much edify, if not the understanding, yet surely the affection, because there it worketh much. They must have hearts very dry and tough, from whom such melody and harmony doth not sometime draw that wherein a mind religiously affected doth delight."

We must, however, confess, that whatever are our theories, or dreams, or hopes, we are at present, and have been for many generations, leaving a great "help to devotion" unused; or so abusing it, that it were as well not used at all. How different the conduct of the Romish Church abroad, and the Dissenters at home, both more wisely alive to the efficacy of this mystery! The Dissenter uses it for its binding, uniting qualities, as a help to the preservation of the congregational feeling, by bringing a large body of the people into active and sensible co-operation. Though it is used coarsely, because of the coarseness of the hand that touches it, it does its work in this respect; it binds, it cements: the congregational hymns create congregational sympathy; singing together tightens the cord of fellowship, and helps greatly to associate souls. It is also no mean medium for the circulation of particular doctrine, and the more successful, because it acts somewhat imperceptibly; it fastens certain words and phrases in the memory: particular tunes recall particular words; they serve also to make the phrases palatable; and many, we believe, have sung themselves into Calvinism, whom a more naked exhibition of such doctrine little affected. We know full well with what zeal and wisdom the Romish Church has seized upon the powers of music to affect her people, and to add to the impressiveness of her various services. Far, indeed, has she strayed from ancient purity of style; and acting too much on the desire to produce effect, she has been drawn into the adoption of a somewhat theatrical and showy style; there is a want of severity and grandeur in her modern compositions. "The modern writers of

the (Roman) Catholic Church," observes the writer already quoted, "among whom we include Nasse, Jomelli, and their contemporaries, too frequently regard words as the mere vehicle of sound; and whether the music, written to the same words, be grave or gay, seems the mere effect of caprice or chance. The solemn invocation with which the mass opens is, by the same composer, set to music of a totally opposite character; at one time with becoming gravity and solemnity, at another with a sole desire to make the movement sparkling and showy. The words implore the mercy of God and of Christ, while the music affords, and is designed to afford, to the *prima donna* of the choir the welcome opportunity of displaying her *agilità di voce.* 'The peace of God' is supplicated at the close of the mass by the rapid and noisy reiteration of a hackneyed operatic cadence, to the words 'Dona nobis,' a dozen times repeated with intervening symphonies. The grand crash is reserved for the 'pacem,' which is shouted to the full roar and din of the orchestra, 'the brass band' being at this point let loose, and the enraptured drummers enjoying the licence and luxury of a *fortissimo.*"

The later Roman music is characteristic of the later Roman mind: it is without Gregorian chasteness or holiness. What greater contrast can be conceived than between the Gregorian chants and Mozart's masses? And it was well observed by one who is both a good Churchman and a good musician, that at Milan, where the Gregorian tones continue to be used with a laudable tenacity, they seemed too stern for the services; they seemed like a piece of grand and awful Norman amidst the elaborate delicate fretwork of a florid perpendicular chapel.

But still, whatever the peculiar merits or demerits of Romish or dissenting music, they both *have* music; they both cultivate it; they both recognize it as a weapon that may be used on God's side, that may be made as easily to heighten or revive religious emotions, as to fascinate in the service of the world. We alone have been careless; we alone have been letting a great power slip from our hands through indifference and neglect.

And yet there is nothing in the spirit of the English Church which would lead to this neglect of music. On the contrary, the English Church would encourage its cultivation; she would blend it with all her services; she would take it as a handmaid into all her holy places. If we have her spirit, if we breathe and taste her mind, if we try to work according to her mind, or make the working of the Church according to her spirit, we shall not fail to restore music to its proper place. How completely, for instance, is the whole cathedral system interwoven with music! it seems the very breath of cathedrals, the sweet breath that should always issue

from them. When indeed weakness, and inefficiency, and scanty attendance of the members, and irreverence and want of heart were, through many generations, manifest in cathedrals; when the vast cathedral system had dwindled down into a mere shadow and mockery of its grand design; when the service had become unmusical or badly musical, then at last a great portion of the endowments was swept away. "The visible rhetoric" of a daily service, well attended by priests and lay clerks, was wanting to stay the spoliation when spoliation was desired. Cathedral bodies could only appeal to their theories for their defence; and theories, after years of practical neglect, speak with a faint voice. The systematic absence of the higher clergy from their stalls, that they might keep other preferment, furnished the Ecclesiastical Commissioners with the idea of a superfluity of members; virtual non-existence for the greater part of the year, or such partial cathedral life as was lived in three months, suggested the actual annihilation of a portion of the body. The practical misrepresentation of the cathedral system for two centuries has been the chief spoiler of cathedrals. Thus the Church has suffered a lasting loss, because her musical spirit was not rightly felt, or her notions of a grand sublime musical service forgotten or despised. If the service had been conducted in cathedrals with all that richness and reverence which they were designed to show, we should have seen no seizure of their revenues.

But while our Liturgy is designed to be musical throughout; while, as in cathedrals, that is considered to be the most perfect development of the Liturgy which is musical throughout, there is nothing in the English capacity that unfits them for excelling either in the composition or the practice of Church music. Indeed, the voices of the English are, as we conceive, peculiarly suited to the graver and more solemn styles of composition. They have little flexibility, but they have great sweetness of tone, with considerable power of sustaining the longer notes; whereas, with a rash and sad contradiction, it has been the fashionable humour to addict ourselves to the Italian school, which we literally "*execute*." Requiring, as it does, great flexibility but little modulation of tone, the qualifications which we possess are wasted, and those we have not are in demand. There is plenty of power in the English both to compose and to sing if the power were used. We firmly believe in the possibility of a general cultivation of music for Church purposes; and our belief springs from the sober contemplation of by-gone times. We have but to go back to the Elizabethan age, to be convinced of the power and strength of English musical faculty when duly trained. We *have* been a musical people; and as what has been may be again, we

light our torch of hope from the facts and recollections of past times.

We know that it has been the fashion to believe that we are not a musical people; that we have it not in us to be musical; that we are wanting both in power and conception, and in practical skill, in mind and in ear. Mawkish effeminate ballads are put forth as the representatives and samples of English capacity, and the want of modern compositions of a higher cast is supposed to prove that we cannot rise beyond such trashy productions. Now if St. James's church in Piccadilly, or the church in Langham-place, or the thousand thin and contemptible structures of modern date that disgrace the land, are fair specimens of English architectural capacity, we will freely confess, without further argument, that "The Bay of Biscay, O," "I'd be a Butterfly," and "Cherry Ripe," are the noblest possible developments of the English musical mind. As we go back to vindicate our architectural capacity, we may as reasonably go back to vindicate our musical capacity. It is true that the Romanist may maintain that the great triumphs in architecture were achieved previous to the Reformation; that we then rose above our own natural powers by the inspiring influence of the Church; by the possession of that mind, that spirit, which has all the elements of grandeur in every art, and has now departed from us. But while we allow that Church feeling did dignify our natural powers, we are slow to admit that the Romish branch of the Church has exclusively this dignifying and ennobling principle, for we would point to the present architectural spirit, which, it is true, the Church, but not the Romish Church, has quickened. But the case of music is entirely different. We vindicate the English from the popular and ignorant charge of musical incapacity, not by going back to times previous to the Reformation, but to those succeeding it. It is since the Reformation that we have excelled both as composers and as singers.

To speak first of our compositions; we point with devout exultation to the great body of Cathedral music. When we are asked "Where is your English school?" we lead the inquirer into the temple of God, and say, "Here is our English school; here in our Cathedral music; here in our holy anthems; here in our rich moving services; here in our expressive solemn chants is our English mind, as trained by the Church, as exercised in so devout and ennobling a cause." Here is abundant proof that we are not wanting in natural power, or taste or skill, if we will but cultivate our natural gifts. Where, we would ask, is there any school of music more exalted, more chaste, more full of science, more sublime in conception, and yet

withal having a character of its own, marked with a national peculiarity, expressive of the English mind, trained and rightly disciplined by the Church? Truly has Mr. Jebb observed, "I am sure I am not going too far in maintaining that our Cathedral music has a substantive excellence unknown to any other Church upon earth." And the writer of "The English Cathedral Service" observes, in the same strain, "Our Church writers, from Tallis to Battishall, may be regarded as the best models of vocal part-writing; and in all the characteristics of ecclesiastical composition which the English school shares in common with those of Italy and Germany, it holds no second place." Just let us call to mind the names of our greater composers, which will immediately suggest so many grand and moving productions left for our use. The writer just quoted, in speaking of the Elizabethan age, when the full vigour of the English genius was put forth, furnishes us with a list of glorious names: "To Tallis and Tye, the English fathers of the art, were speedily and successfully added Byrd, Farrant, Morley, Bull, Weelkes, Kirby, Fanner, Dowland, Bateson, Gibbons." After this we have Hawes, Hooke, Child, Rogers, Weldon, Aldrich, and others. These are the greater lights which still continue to shine in their works, while there were doubtless a host of lesser constellations partaking somewhat of their spirit. In the writers we have mentioned, we have the combination of all those qualities which constitute them great musicians; vigour of invention, science, knowledge of their subject, and true discernment of the style befitting it, are manifest in their work. Indeed, in devotional harmony, which is, after all, music's chief strength, they may be said to excel the writers of any other school in the world. The earlier anthems and services are rich in continued harmony; harmony is their forte, and ought to be the forte of musicians who devote their genius to the Church; they at once felt the choral and congregational character of the Church service; they understood what was meant by "Common Prayer;" they gave themselves accordingly to the production of essentially choral music; they wrote for a large body of voices; nor was it till degenerate times came on that the harmony of the English school declined.

It is true that in appealing to this class of composers as mainly constituting "The English School," we prove in fact that ours has been chiefly a Church school. Our cathedral music is our English music; we have, if we except madrigals and some glees, no other compositions of a high order. Of the madrigals, many certainly have a highly ecclesiastical character; the fair Oriana was panegyrised with many most psalmlike strains, and wakened

from her sleep by serenades grave and lugubrious. Though we like each separate subject to have its own distinct and separate style, it is better that the worldly music should partake of the Church than, as is now too common, that Church music should partake of the world. We had better have solemn madrigals than operatic hymns. It is, however, this very fact, that we have more clearly excelled in Church music than in that of any other sort, which prevents us from hopelessly yielding to the trash with which the Church is now inundated, as though improvement were impossible.

But not only have we abundant proof of our capacity for compositions of the highest class, but we have also testimony of a considerable cultivation and practice of music among the people. A few master minds might have risen as composers, and yet there would have been no evidence of a general appreciation of their works; they might have been handed to us as wonders, never enjoyed or felt, but only wondered at. But if we have a large body of composers, a thick phalanx, a rich cluster of writers, rising in quick succession the one after the other, we have strong presumption that there was much music among the people, much love for it, much knowledge, and much perception of what was good. And this view is still further strengthened by considering that this multitude of composers wrote in an essentially *choral* style. Would they have all continued writing chorally, if there had been no chance of getting their music performed, of obtaining a body of voice that would do justice to their music, and give it its designed effects? When at last a less choral style was adopted, it was probably the decay of musical knowledge among the people that threw the composers upon a less choral system, that forced them to seek their effects from solos and duets, and trios; to attend more to air and less to harmony.

But the madrigal music is, from its very nature, strong evidence in support of our belief that music was once widely and popularly known: for here is a kind of music wholly depending on a large body of voice. It wants numbers. Duly to perform a madrigal there should be some thirty or forty voices. And this was the popular music of the Elizabethan age, as popular as ballads are amongst ourselves. As to Church music, we have but to take up an old Prayer-book, where we find the tunes printed with the metrical psalms, to obtain another argument in support of our opinion. To have had the tunes printed as well as the words, would have been a most superfluous work, a mere waste of type, and unreasonable expense, if congregations had no musical portion to whom they were of use. The custom implies know-

ledge on the part of the people, and though it ceased with the neglect of music, we must return to this plan of the old Prayer-books should we ever regain our knowledge.

The English school was, however, of no long continuance; vigorous for a time, it lost the source of its strength when the piety of the Church waxed cold. The writer of "the English Cathedral Service," dates its decline from the reign of James I., admitting at the same time that there were yet gleams of olden excellence, that many great geniuses rose, and caused a sort of twilight to precede the darkness of the last century. The decline was gradual, we did not at once become unmusical: we did not at once descend from Tallis to Kent, or from Gibbons to Jackson. We had our steps and stages of deterioration. Harmony gradually gave way to naked melody, the tone of the Church to the tone of the theatre, or the drawing-room. We see in the descent that the composers, besides losing grandeur of mind, science, true pathos, devout feeling, felt the loss of a full choir. Increasing weakness on their part was accompanied by increasing ignorance on the part of the people. The composers, therefore, were compelled to trust to single voices or a few voices, and not to a body of voices; to trust to air not to harmony. As time went on, they were constrained to depend on a celebrated bass, or a celebrated tenor, to a capricious few, who felt the importance of their voices or knowledge amid the general scarcity. The full anthems were succeeded by verse anthems, in which the celebrated bass and tenor showed off their voices or their skill. The full "Te Deum," lost its chant-like character, and became more like a series of airs; it ceased to be like a varied chant, which would seem to be the perfect mode of expressing it. The chants too as gradually assumed a lighter character, and the double chant, only tolerable when it preserves something of the antiphonal effect of the single chant, was almost exclusively used; whereas, as the author of "the Apology" has so well said, "a chant should be all compact;" it may easily be too tuneful. The psalms for either morning or evening contain sentiments so various, that by a very striking air some of them *must* be ill expressed; to say nothing of the wearisomeness of thirty or forty repetitions of a remarkable phrase in a short air, in the course of a quarter of an hour.

Not only did the music lose its choral character, but, as a natural consequence, it lost its religious and ecclesiastical tone. When a few men sang, it began to be considered that they were singing *to* the congregation. From the Restoration downwards, we must note an increasing secularity. All distinctness of style disappeared. Even Purcell's most brilliant mind was infected by

the age. One of the most vigorous and original minds was unable to stem the tide. Much as we owe him, and deeply as we admire his works, we had almost wished that he had lived in less vicious and secular times. He was tempted to divide his affections between the theatre and the Church; we know not what the theatre gained, but we know what the Church lost; a great light was clouded. Later still, as though cathedrals were waste places which no one entered, where good music was not, or could not be sung, for which it was not worth writing, the composers of sacred music took refuge in the concert-room, by the invention of the oratorio, an invention which unhappily attracted the mighty genius of Handel, and was highly characteristic of a secular age, being little more than a sort of sacred opera, in which great singers stand up before an admiring audience, and sing not to the glory of God, but to the satisfaction of the audience, and their own temporal profit. Alas! that the daily prayer even of cathedrals should be disturbed by the occasional intrusion of oratorios, at what are called "Festivals." At last we reach the wretched undevotional, but popular Jackson, who effectually extinguished the last glimmer of good taste and devout feeling in Church Music. Such was the decline into which our music gradually fell, after years of vigour, and its vigour has been popularly forgotten in the contemplation of the shrunken and sickly features of its later years.

But without going farther into the proof of the English musical capacity (and we will admit that our genius is not of that exuberant kind, that it will grow and ripen without culture), we think it sufficiently clear that we have been a musical people. And if we have once been musical, are we never to hope or never to strive for the revival of a dormant and neglected gift, that can be brought so powerfully to bear on our spiritual state? Happily there are gleams in the sky at this present time, many cheerful signs of awakening zeal, longings of heart for the old songs of the temple, and the old skill in singing them. The increasing piety of the age is itself likely to lead to the ardent cultivation of all powers that can help to greater devotionalness of mind. Among the more direct signs of the times, we may notice the multitude of recent publications on Church music. Ten years ago scarcely a work of the kind appeared; a provincial volume of old psalm-tunes spoilt, or of new psalm-tunes of the Rossini school, or of solemn variations of the popular air of the last opera, was occasionally put forth by some country-town organist, of ambitious mind. As for any other works of thought or true feeling, really ecclesiastical or sound, investigating the theory, or helping the right practice of Church music, there were none such to be found. But now we cannot glance at any page of advertisements,

at the upper strata of any bookseller's shop, without seeing almost countless works grappling with every branch of the subject, some practical, others theoretical; some giving notes, others principles; some entering into the whole choral system, others digging up the Gregorian tones; and all betraying something better than merely a professional or scientific view of the matter, and entering on the subject with that devout enthusiasm which seems necessary for success. It would be endless to enumerate much more, to enter into the details of the works recently issued. We can but mention the most important. Foremost in rank comes Mr. Jebb's excellent and elaborate work. Such a work is itself enough to give us hopes of the age. It is earnest, true-hearted, and, what is more, fearless in its rebukes of present errors and neglect. We sincerely wish that Mr. Jebb could be induced to issue it in an abridged and more moderate form, that it might obtain as wide a circulation as it deserves. Its present size and cost prevent its usefulness, by putting it beyond the reach of any, who are not already somewhat of enthusiasts in the cause; whereas, we want to raise a true spirit among those as yet but slightly affected. Another thoughtful work has appeared by a gentle enthusiast, entitled "the Apology for the Cathedral Service." The writer feels every word he speaks; his book is a true book; we see a true mind talking in its leaves. There is a warm sorrow for the present weakness of the cathedral service, which, when duly performed, he so beautifully calls "a celestial service," while his strictures are mixed with a grave playfulness, the lightness of a mind that keeps its youth even in its maturity. We must also mention an able volume, entitled, "The English Cathedral Service." We hope the writer, clearly an ardent and discerning lover of true Church music, takes a too desponding view of our condition, or rather of our prospects. It is, however, a work of great power, full of melancholy truth and facts, and taking a true view of the cathedral system and cathedral duties. Nor must we fail to speak of the magnificent and costly reprint of ancient Merbecke, which has issued from the press of the enterprising and tasteful Mr. Pickering. As for editions of Tallis and of Gregorian tones, they increase daily. We rejoice at the sight of all these publications. Much writing and reading must precede any general cultivation of Church music; and the more minds are working upon the subject, the more likely is the foundation to be rightly and deliberately laid. Not that we are altogether without deeds as well as words. We need only allude to the service at St. Mark's college, at the parish church, Leeds, at St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and at many other churches both in town and country. And what gives

stronger substance to our hopes is the fact, that these and such-like efforts have risen from a more devout contemplation of the Church and its offices. The movement has begun in the right place; the Church movement has preceded, and has caused the musical movement; a merely musical movement would be disappointing; but when the Liturgy is studied by pious minds, and it becomes the desire of the Church to glorify God with the best exercise of his gifts, then we see the subject entered upon in a right spirit; there is less danger of music becoming a mere taste or an amusement.

But, at this stage of advancement, we think it time to be directing men's minds especially to practical results, that is, to the practical improvement of Church music; we shall make no apology for offering, as our contribution to the cause, a few remarks of a practical character. And, first of all, we must express our strong conviction, that there can be no permanent improvement *unless the clergy are once more skilled in music, unless it is made a necessary and essential part of clerical education.* Here and there a temporary improvement may be seen, where some particular clergyman is something of an enthusiast; but enthusiasts are scarce; we must not trust to be lighted by comets; we want continual, even light. The present rising tide will most surely ebb after a time, unless it is kept up and directed by the clergy, unless they acquire more knowledge of music as well as interest; for interest without knowledge is fitful and capricious. The present feeling will either decline, or degenerate into a mere abstract study and admiration of music, unless the clergy keep the devotional feeling alive as well as the music, and the music alive as well as the devotional feeling. A sort of patronage of music, with a notorious ignorance of that which they patronise, a standing by and approving, or censuring, where the censure or praise are equally without discrimination, is not the part which the clergy must play, if they desire to make music, what in God's service it might and ought to be made; undiscerning admiration is worse than none; the affectation of interest is without influence; and the learned archdeacon who praised a service in K., would have been more wise by being mute.

Now, if music ought to be made a part of clerical education, it ought, at least, to form a part of University education, even if its principles are not instilled at the public schools. The University authorities could not do better at this present day than show their readiness practically to meet the wants of their times. Thus they might wisely introduce the study both of architecture and music, under proper rules and restrictions; they would be

gaining the management of tastes which will be pursued, and which by a wise, and prompt, and cautious interference, may be pursued with profit. By allotting stated times to such studies, they may prevent them either being followed in a desultory way, or absorbing all the time of those who keenly feel their attraction. Music is, of course, the most important study, as its knowledge is of daily use and daily application. Churches may be built or restored, or increased with skill and taste, though the incumbents themselves are blind to all architectural proprieties, if they resign themselves wholly into the hands of discerning men; but music is not so advantageously handed over to others; it wants constant interest, attention, criticism, control, watchfulness.

Now, besides the advantages which must arise, if the great body of the clergy were skilled in music, in that which, whether ill done or well done, is a part of Divine Service, we see many other considerations that seem to invite the University authorities to make some efforts in such a cause. We would appeal to the more selfish principle, venturing to suggest whether it is not possible that the encouragement of studies which partake so much of a relaxation may not help to make a University career more satisfactory even at the time, apart from after results. Surely it would be no unwise step to furnish the young men with good relaxations, and to oppose hurtful or foolish pleasures by a prudent provision of such as are harmless. Viewing music simply as a good relaxation, or a good excitement to certain minds when duly controlled, we think it might be made to fill up many idle and wasted hours, to prove a successful rival to many questionable pursuits in hours of idleness, and as a counter-attraction to exceed in interest. And what *material* is there in the Universities for showing the power of music! With what strength it might be endued! What stirring sounds might be made to swell from a multitude of voices, now either ignorant of their powers, or wasting them apart from one another in childish and foolish songs! Two or three hundred voices joining in one of the fine old anthems of the Church would soon make an interest in the cause; the young men would soon grow warm with such holy harmony, and covet to take part; while we need not say how gladly such a recreation would be accepted by that more thoughtful portion of undergraduates which is now happily springing up. If the minds of many young men had been lately engaged in pursuits serviceable to the English Church, and admitting some measure of enthusiasm common to youth, they might have been contented with the food provided them by their own Mother, instead of seeking to satisfy the cravings of their eager spirit with Romish theories. We want

the wisdom rightly to employ, to busy, to interest ardent spirits; we seem so afraid of a little enthusiasm that we take no pains to direct it. We should like to see in the Universities something besides a "chair" attached to the Professorship of Music; we should like to see it made a practical and useful office, and the instruction of the young men intrusted to the professors (none more qualified than those who now hold the empty recompense of a chair), and those professors bound, not to deliver a terminal lecture to an empty room, but with proper assistants, throughout every term to carry on a system of education.

But we commend this subject to the University authorities, not simply because of the benefit which would in all likelihood accrue to the Universities themselves, but because the introduction of such a study would be of the highest practical service to the Church. A clergy well trained in music would go forth well prepared to render every part of Divine Service as far as possible worthy of its end. They would be able at least to superintend the instruction of their flocks; and knowledge on their part would provoke knowledge on the part of their congregations. Parishes would cease to have fits of music and fits of unmusicalness; such fits depending on the accidental absence or presence of some musical or unmusical clergyman for the time. There would be a continued system at work, varying only in intensity or in degree of excellence, according to the keener or less lively love of music in the clergy for the time.

It may, however, be asked whether we can make all the clergy musical. Without going so far as a modern notion, that every body can sing if they are taught, we are ready to believe that but few are so disqualified by nature as to make the study of music in early life a hopeless or useless task. But of the vast class who can acquire considerable knowledge, a still smaller class, it is true, will be found able to sing; but in the clergy we do not want so much the power of singing, as of criticising; we want knowledge more than voice, though of course it gives additional impulse to congregational singing where the clergy are able actively to take part. We believe that by cultivation the clergy on the whole would be filled with such an amount of knowledge as would fit them to be good judges of the music that ought to be performed, the portion of the service that ought to be musical, and the manner of the performance. They would at least learn to have a reverence for certain names, and a just horror of certain other names; they would know that Jackson is bad and Gibbons is good; they would have their "Fathers" in music; and by sticking even mechanically to their musical calendar, we should

have a defence against the invasion of quavering lackadaisical hymns and sing-song jig-like chants; we should be sure of pure, and chaste, and ecclesiastical compositions.

And what is the result of present clerical ignorance on this matter? Take first the present condition of the cathedral service in the majority of cathedrals. Mr. Jebb has truly called it "a niggardly service." We have majestic temples, that make one's very souls bow themselves and feel the presence of God more sensibly; we have rich revenues that the service may be proportioned to the temple in grandeur, in magnificence, in holy richness; and yet we must feel in most cases that we have nothing to meet our expectations, to carry on the enthusiasm or the warm feelings of devotion that the outward building excites; we must feel that the ten or twelve thousand a-year or more does yield but "a niggardly service," that the cathedral does not have its own priests, that its stalls are empty or but partly filled, that its revenues are not returned into its own bosom. When we see the thin scanty body of ministering persons, lay and clerical, half of whom are incompetent to do the service, we instinctively exclaim, "What would the Romish Church do if the cathedrals were in its possession now! What instant increase of ministering persons would be made: all these empty stalls would be filled!" In short, we cannot say that cathedrals are in a satisfactory state; that they fulfil, or are felt to fulfil their purpose; that they are the glorious patterns to which all other Churches should wisely look. We cannot say that we have in most cathedrals the greatest possible effect given to the Liturgy, that our ideal, or any ideal, of the real beauty of our service is daily realized. On the contrary, the service in most cases, to use the mildest term, disappoints us; it is notoriously disappointing, and most disappointing to those who, like ourselves, are the most ardent admirers, the most hearty lovers of the cathedral system. When we are awed and almost overpowered, as at Lincoln or York, by the outward and inward sublimity of the building, we undergo a positive reaction as the service begins. We expect we hardly know what as we enter,—something very solemn, very rich, very touching and soul-stirring; we are in a mood to feel deeply the sweet solemn sounds of musical praise, or the penitential tones of confession; but we have certainly just what we did not expect. If it is not a hasty slovenly service, it is weak and ineffective; fine music perhaps attempted, but not performed for want of a sufficient number to fill up the parts; no basses on this side or no tenors on that, so that it becomes, if we may so speak, a lop-sided service. The cathedral system, the theory, is not carried out; and thus the cathedral service has ceased to

retain the love of the best part of the people. Here and there exceptions may be found, as at Exeter, Durham, and Canterbury. We see more reverence, more marks of zeal and care, a greater and more punctilious attendance of ministering persons at daily prayer, a greater air of interest and of heart in the service; the boys are not laughing and cracking nuts. And what is the consequence? There are larger congregations; more interest in the cathedral on the part of the laity. The greater zeal of the cathedral body is instantly met by greater appreciation of the privileges of such places of daily prayer by the people. At the same time, we must not be supposed to say that even these cathedrals are in the state in which they ought to be.

But, in other cases, place the actual state of the cathedral opposite the theory; where is the "full-voiced choir," where the college of resident priests, chanting the service daily, assisted by a considerable body of lay clerks? Putting Sundays out of the question, (which, as they are too often looked upon as "show days," and made, in some measure, to atone for week-day neglect, are no tests whatever of the ordinary or real state of a cathedral,) a single canon, a single minor canon, four or five lay clerks[1], or less, and a few boys, represent the whole energy of the system. In order that the nakedness of things, the inefficiency or insufficiency of the staff may be less discerned, the organ is made to act as a noisy proxy for the absent priests and laymen; the great body of sound proceeds from that which can neither praise nor pray; and thus even prayer and praise, in these days, seems resigned in a great measure to machinery. If organs had not been invented, we know not what would have been done.

Of course the first act of amendment must consist in the permanent residence of the capitular body in their cathedral town; residence is now the exception, absence the rule. The income of chapters is evidently assigned them, not for living away from their cathedrals[2], but for living near them. Who would have been so absurd as to have left 1000*l.* per annum to a presbyter, for three months' residence? Or who will be so mad as to dream of endowing honorary canonries, when the endowment would be spent at a country living? But this is not all: we do not conceive that such a change as would recommend the modern cathedral system to the admiration of the more thoughtful part of the people, would be effected solely by increased attendance

[1] We recently saw *two* lay-clerks at one of the largest and richest cathedrals.

[2] We wish it were not the fashion to build or buy episcopal houses in the country apart from the cathedrals, whereby a bishop's attendance at daily prayer becomes an impossibility. It is doubtless pleasanter to live in the country, but we want bishops in towns.

of the members, however excellent in itself. The whole body of officiating priests, both canons and minor canons, must take a part in Divine Service, that Service being musical throughout. This would be a fulfilment of the cathedral theory; for the service was not designed to be left chiefly to laymen, while the priests did but listen or join in spirit; the priests were to lead, to perform the service, while richness and fulness of sound were to be attained by the assistance of lay clerks. As it is, canons[3] do not, or cannot, intone the prayers; even at Durham, among the best of cathedrals, the Sunday morning prayers are completely spoilt by the unmusical tones of the canons, whose part it is to intone the prayers, while they will not make the effort. "For the sake of truth we must observe," says Brown, in his Dissertation on Poetry and Music, "that in the performance of cathedral music, a separation has taken place fatal to its true utility. The higher ranks of the Church do not think themselves concerned in its performance. It were devoutly to be wished that their musical education were so general, as to enable the clergy, of whatever rank, to join the choir in the celebration of their Creator in all its appointed forms;" the author of "the Apology," having these words before him, proceeds to say, "This passage was printed in the year 1763, when it may be presumed the declension which it deplores had been very rapid; for at the coronation of George the First, the Litany was chanted by two bishops, a precedent which the well-known taste of George the Third assures us would not have been departed from at his accession, if the episcopal bench had enabled him to follow it. Cathedral statutes take for granted that capitulars have a knowledge of music, or appointments to musical stations in the Church would not have been left in their hands; but if they should not have enough, the statutes still provide against the want of it being very mischievous, by enjoining 'that the minor canons, and lay clerks, be men whose skill in singing shall be acknowledged by the judgment of those who are cunning in the art of music in the same.' . . . The same inference, as to the acquaintance of the higher clergy with music, may be drawn from the statutes of collegiate foundations; *e.g.* at the royal chapel of St. George, the dean and canons of Windsor may command the teachers to bring the boys before them, that they may be heard and *tried* whether they profit in grammar and *music*, as they ought to do.' We smile without scruple at the ignorance of ecclesiastics in the dark

[3] We heard recently for the first time in our lives a canon chant. Dr. Williams, the warden of New College, intoned the prayers admirably at Winchester cathedral.

ages; but the general unacquaintance of the clergy of our own times with that 'only science, besides divinity, which is suffered to enter the Church,' might abate our contempt for their ignorance who built our cathedrals, and were qualified to take a due share in the worship enjoined to be performed in them."

We have, indeed, a painful instance of the injury which cathedrals have received through the ignorance of music amongst their members. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners, having in their minds the one great object of capitular spoliation, hit upon certain officers called Precentors. In a certain number of cathedrals, those of the later foundation, they found the Precentors poor enough, and, though poor, having some knowledge of their duties, and trying in some measure to fulfil them. But they came to another class of Precentors, who ranked as Canons, who had good houses, good incomes, good offices altogether. When this booty was beheld, it was quickly asked, "Of what use are Precentors?" "What is it that they do?" The question was repeated, and no commissioner could reply. "Destroy the Precentors," was then the universal cry. "It is now an useless office; they do but live three months in the cathedral town; they cannot sing; they cannot chant; they cannot criticise; in short they cannot do the Precentors' work." There was no pointing out Canonical Precentors who were doing their work, who were skilled in music, who were superintending the performances of the choir; and so the last century of Precentorial ignorance and incompetency was in this practical age the argument for their virtual extinction. The office was made honorary, and honorary it will remain. It is true that the commissioners ought not so much to have asked, what is it that the Precentors do, as, what have they to do? What ought they to do? What is their work? What is the theory concerning them? What part have they in the system? They would have found abundant cause for retaining these officers with untouched incomes, if they had reverenced the system and theory of cathedrals; but in this short-sighted age, when men are found filling offices ill, the office is to be reckoned as an ill thing or an useless one. Let us hear what Mr. Jebb says of the duties of those whom the Ecclesiastical Commission supposes to have no duties worth paying for, and whose perpetual absence they have accordingly provided for. "To the Precentor the superintendence of the principal part of the Church Service belonged. He examined and superintended the chanters, fixed the services and anthems for the week, and was responsible for the appointment of the choir-boys. On the greater feasts he intoned and commenced the Church-hymns. Thus that most important and religious office of regulating the

Church music was regarded as it ought to be, worthy the personal superintendence of one of the chief dignitaries, who himself took part in its performance."

We do not, however, for a moment cast the slightest shadow of blame upon canonical bodies because they are ignorant of music; it would be the height of injustice to visit upon them the blame which lies equally at the door of all the clergy. They are but priests, taken out of the great body of priests, and cannot be supposed to have other or higher qualifications than those commonly possessed by the body; if the clergy are ignorant of music, how can we expect canons to be skilled in music? The fault lies with the clergy at large, to whom the ordering of the music, whether in cathedrals or parish churches, is intrusted, while they are at this present time quite incompetent to order it. Till the clergy have a musical education, we must bear with the present weak, and languid, and imperfect representation of the cathedral service.

When we turn from cathedrals to parish churches we find like traces of the evil results of the clergy's ignorance of music. First of all, the whole ordering of the music, so properly vested in the clergy, is really resigned to the organist, and, where there is no organist, to the choir. The style of music chosen by these persons, who in many cases have received little of an education in music, none in ecclesiastical music, is naturally often most unecclesiastical. Hence we have the drawing-room chants and melodramatic Te Deums we have spoken of, adapted from profane airs, and ever associated with words profane, with wondrous organ accompaniments, in which the organist celebrates himself, and ingeniously makes his Sunday "execution," an economical advertisement for pianoforte pupils in the week. And not only is the music debased and bad, but, what is worse than any mere deficiency in knowledge, the coterie in the gallery is not always celebrated for reverent demeanour in church; being packed up out of the sight of the clergy, there is often a shuffling over of books, a skurrying into church just before the Te Deum, and inattention to every thing but the music. Such conduct (no rare thing in parish churches) brings the whole musical portion of the service into disrepute; it is connected with irreverence and irreverent persons; it gives the congregation a distaste for music, and disposes them to think that there must be something radically wrong in its tendencies, because it is abused. And this indifference or distaste is still further heightened by the style of the music itself, which is commonly so wholly uncongregational in its character, full of trios and solos, that those who wish to join in it are positively repelled; and, more than this, parts of the service are sung

to which the choir is not equal, which are quite above their powers; difficult music is presumptuously preferred to simpler; intricate anthems are mangled, when easier ones might have been attempted, and a miserable caricature of the cathedral service is the result of all this pretending ignorance of half-trained choirs. And what can the clergy do? Their ignorance of music is known; they cannot choose good music; or if they stumble on it by chance, they cannot criticise its performance; they have no weight with the organist and the choir; they must leave the matter with those into whose hands it has unfitly fallen; they half hate, half dread "the gallery;" they cannot see what goes on; the congregation complain of the music; the gallery (for musical skins are ever thin), are touchy and threaten to depart. Music is the apple of discord; they want congregational singing, but cannot get it; they dislike the gallery, but they cannot defy it, for they have no confidence in their own powers, no knowledge how to set to work and provide a new and more teachable substitute.

Now, if the clergy were skilled in music, they would be able to choose good ecclesiastical music, suited to the powers of their choir and congregation; they would hinder musical ambition from over-singing itself; they would bring the choir into the midst of the congregation, and rend the miserable curtain that but half hides so much irreverence; their authority as ministers would be supported by their knowledge as musicians; their known interest in the music would act in time on the congregation; they would be able to induce many persons, especially the more devout, to join in the singing, to practise either at home or in a parochial class; they might increase or form their choirs by the aid of volunteers, who now shrink from the gallery system.

We may observe, by the way, that open seats, *all looking one way*, seem likely to give the greatest encouragement to congregational singing; those who sing do not feel the eyes of their neighbours fixed upon them; they can sing without observation, and it requires more than common powers of abstraction, especially in timid persons, to be faced and not to feel or think about it.

But we believe that not only the choir and the congregation, but that that most important body, the organists, would in time be acted upon by the cultivation of music among the clergy. The organists have now to make their own way towards the ecclesiastical style; no wonder if, among other employments, they sometimes miss it; but when once the clergy were interested in the organist's business, the organists, happy in such new and cheerful sympathy, would be apt to catch from them

something of an ecclesiastical mind; the organists of our cathedrals, justly observes the author of "The Apology," are in general men of great professional knowledge; yet the statutes, with much wisdom have assigned the chief direction of the music to the precentor, who will often be swayed by nice considerations, to which a layman might be less sensitive, and he will constantly have the advantage of consulting his colleague. That an ecclesiastic placed in such a post as this should himself be skilled in music, is a truth which cannot need enforcement." We agree entirely with these remarks; but we would make them of more general application, and not confine them to the precentors and organists of cathedrals; for we hold that every clergyman is the precentor of his parish church, and ought to be qualified for the post. He ought to be a more discerning critic than the organist of the spirit, the tone, the fitness of the music, more skilled in the ἦθος, less skilled in the service. Let us suppose a clergy thus skilled; must it not follow that their intercourse with the organists, their co-operation, their sympathy, will help to convey to them a portion of their spirit, a portion of the ecclesiastical mind, which is now so often wanting, and the want of which is manifested in the flimsy unchurch-like secular airs, with which the metrical psalms and other hymns of the Church are now dressed out.

As in these last remarks we have been gliding from the clergy to the laity, by considering the condition of the organists, we cannot but express a wish that at St. Mark's College, or other institutions, there were a department devoted to the instruction of organists, where young churchmen of musical promise might be duly trained for their important work, and enabled to add with advantage the office of organist to that of schoolmaster. The cathedrals are now the only schools for organists; they must always be the best places of instruction; but those only are educated therein who are likely to make music their sole profession, while the lesser parish churches are left to those who have not made music their profession, and have only managed to pick up some scraps of knowledge.

As to cathedrals, where the service is musical throughout, and ought daily to be performed with the utmost skill, we would wish to see the organist put in a higher position altogether. In the cathedrals of the older foundation, he virtually occupies the precentor's post, and adds the precentor's duties to his own. The whole burden and responsibility of the music rests upon him. He must be a scientific and a practical man; he must know what to teach and how to teach; he must have the highest class of musical knowledge, combined with sound Church feeling, and

pure Church taste. He must read and work; he must have knowledge, and the power of imparting it. With all these labours laid upon him, he ought to receive higher remuneration than some 100*l.* or 200*l.* per annum, if the cathedral, as it undoubtedly should, claim all his energies and his time. What is the result of the wretched remuneration which he now receives? He cannot give his whole time and mind to that which deserves it all. He cannot consecrate all his powers to the cathedral. He must be a pianoforte teacher. What drudgery for a man of high musical powers, of great knowledge, of warm feeling and imagination, of acute and delicate ears! He must pass from fantasia to fantasia, from ballad to ballad, wearying himself with dull pupils, and music equally dull, having his ear and mind ever set on edge, and exhausted by these most secular labours, when he should be fresh for the cathedral.

We cannot expect the cathedral service to be what it ought to be till it engages all the time of the organist, till he is present at daily prayer, till he can afford to dethrone the raw aspiring deputy who now occupies his post in the week, and gives exaggerated and clumsy imitations of his master's style, while the choir smile at his crude performances, and mock his authority. At Exeter cathedral the organist attends morning and evening prayer every day, and does not skip "in hot haste" up the organ-loft stairs in time for the anthem; we need hardly stop to describe the effect of this daily attendance.

But not only is this piano forte-teaching life of cathedral organists drudgery, in the truest sense, to men of sensitive minds, as musicians generally are, but it is hard drudgery; it is secularising drudgery; it is a fantasia-ising and variation-ising of the mind; it is drawing it away from the nobler and severer school of study; and he who has an office and ministration in the Church is doomed to be infected and blown upon by the music of the world. And, what is an important question, if the higher class of musicians have not time to give themselves to thought and study, what are we to do for any race of new Church composers of like spirit with the old? Whence are they to come? Are we never to add to our store of Church music? Are all original minds to be seized upon and monopolised by the world? Not indeed that we yearn after mere novelty, or such novelty as contradicts the tone of what is old. "We want," to use Dr. Crotch's words, "new music, but no new style." We cannot expect to have new music of the olden style, to enjoy any great increase of grand and chaste compositions, till the organist pokes his Rossini into the fire, burns all his fantasias, makes his children's kites of his ballads, leaves young ladies to learn "execu-

tion" as they may, and concentrates all his powers on that which alone is worthy of the entire energy of a great musical mind. Till he can afford to do this, he must almost unconsciously get somewhat secularized by the daily and hourly sound of secular music. Yet, what more important than to preserve in Church compositions distinctness of style, to retain strong and marked peculiarities of feature and expression, to maintain the boundaries between the Church and the world? What more wretched than when airs from overtures and operas are transferred to the Church by organists of secular mind, who plume themselves on the adaptation?

Where is the force of association stronger than in music? A tune heard in a theatre is always the theatre's; it always reminds of scenes and footlamps, and paint and tinsel, and actors and actresses. However grave a livery of solemn words it may be made to wear, our mind is transported from the church; the tune cannot become a psalm to us; it wheels us back in spite of ourselves from Sunday thoughts to week-day dissipations; it is but week-day folly starched into a prim Sunday look, and through the grave disguise we cannot but remember the original occasion of the air. Nor shall we be freed from such adaptations, or from a mixed character in Church music, until we cut off the organist from secular employments altogether, until we give him an income sufficient to support him in his sacred office. We know not, indeed, how this is to be done, or how far the Ecclesiastical Commissioners can reconsider their acts; but the thing ought to be done, and an office, not provided for in the older statutes, when organs were not, should not be left, as it often is, to the voluntary contributions of the canons. The canons ought not to be required to expend their income in such a way, but every officer should have his own income, his own position recognised by the statutes, and duly recompensed. We should like to see cathedral organists in Deacon's Orders, that the sacredness of their functions might at once be recognised. We wish, indeed, that choirs also could obtain higher remuneration. In some instances they are sufficiently paid; in others the recompense is most wretched. The Ecclesiastical Commission might have found enough to be done in the cathedrals themselves with cathedral revenues, without appropriating them to purposes foreign both to the letter and the spirit of the endowment, if they had entered into the cathedral system. Subdean Bayley's words ought to have been weighed, "Be it remembered," he says, "that services and anthems *cannot be performed*, to have their due effect, without two contra-tenors, two tenors, and two basses, that the verses may be sung alternately, and choruses in eight parts." Thus we see what a

staff, besides the boys, ought to be employed daily at every service.

We have spoken chiefly of cathedral organists, from the importance of their posts; but it would be a great matter if proper culture and proper discipline of mind and taste could be given to all who take upon them this sacred office. Among the first consequences of such an education would be the subdued tone in which the choir or congregation would be accompanied. Organists would learn to tame their instruments, to consider them strictly as accompaniments; it is ignorance of the proper office of the organ that causes us now to hear those thunderings, and storms, and crashings, which hasten deafness, or make it desirable. In the smaller churches we desire no organs at all, as we cannot hope for the remarkable coincidence of good instruments and persons competent to play them. When will those instruments of acute and ingenious torture, appropriately called "grinders," be abolished by so humane an age?

But what can be done for the great body of the laity? How can we act on them so as to revive in some degree congregational singing? Even here we need not work without hope. We find that their musical impulses have been already stirred, and that these impulses have taken, if not a Church, at any rate a sacred direction. The middling classes (and we always consider the most hearty love of music is to be found in the middling classes) are already seizing upon every means of instruction. The Exeter Hall concerts are no slight evidence of the growth and increase of a musical spirit. Who would have thought a few years ago of hearing some hundreds of tradesmen performing oratorios, and delighting in Handel? And these efforts owe nothing to fashion; we might otherwise be slow to accept them as signs of any real or lasting concern, for fashion coins new idols every year for its fickle idolaters. It is no proof that people enjoy the opera because they go there; but the Exeter Hall concerts, with all their faults, were begun, and have been carried on, by a more sober class of persons, who unaffectedly enjoy the music. If, then, we have these and other evidences of a rising taste, what are we to do? New means of instruction are of course within the reach of the higher classes; they can obtain the best teachers, they have time to practise; they can learn the appointed music of the Church in their own homes, if they know what is to be sung on the Sunday, if a scheme of the music is fixed up in some part of the Church. We cannot conceive a more delightful occupation for those who have leisure on their hand, than to set apart one evening, at least, in the week, for the practice of the music designed for the Sunday following. If, too, selections of sound,

well-arranged music were printed for the use of congregations, we should avoid those extemporary alto and tenor parts, which are now invented on the spot, and are somewhat painful in their effects.

But for the middling classes, who cannot easily learn or practise at home, nor afford separate instruction, some sort of class-singing, parochial or otherwise, must be used. In small country parishes the music must be always a difficulty, from the lack of teachers and of opportunities of receiving instruction, and from the coarseness of rustic tones; but all amendment is not hopeless. Those wondrous anthems, manufactured by inglorious Handels, might at once be stopped; the gruntings of the gruff bassoon, the pantings of the asthmatic flute, and the sharp whine of the piercing violin, may well be exchanged for the voices of the more promising children, who can be kept to the old psalm-tunes, and their country tones refined by careful teaching. But in towns (and of towns we more particularly speak throughout), class-singing seems the easiest means of obtaining the best instruction on moderate terms. In some places excellent institutions have been already formed that promise great results, if there is as much perseverance in conducting as there has been zeal in establishing them. At Exeter, a "School of Church Music" has been set on foot under the immediate direction of the cathedral organist, who labours in the true spirit. Persons of all ranks,—clergy, gentry, clerks, shopkeepers,—attend its meetings; and at the recent consecration of a church in that city, about sixty of its members in the midst of the congregation took part in the service. And how seldom have sixty voices been heard to sing the praise of God in his temple! In the important town of Manchester a "Church Music Society" has arisen, and we have heard of other similar institutions in various parts. We prefer the appellation of "School" rather than "Society," as seeming to imply that it is a place of discipline and training for the Church, not ending in itself, or in the exclusive gratification and profit of its own members; it is a musical nursery for the Church.

But whatever form class-singing may take, we regard it as the most likely means of promoting a general cultivation of music. In our larger towns, where able musicians are to be found, and some of them lovers of the temple as well as of the sweet songs of the temple, ready, for little worldly remuneration, to do what they can in their sphere for the Church's good, some such machinery might advantageously be set on foot. And we may well consider, for a moment, the great work which Church music may help to carry out among the middling classes. It may be made

the means of increasing an attachment to the Church which is at present but faintly felt among these classes; it may revive or deepen a sense of Church-membership; it may save a portion of the younger men from the hurtful pleasures of large towns. And we may well begin to do something indirectly as well as directly to recover the affections of the middling classes, to create among them an interest in the Church and Church objects. While the higher orders and the poor are mostly attached members of the Church, we have our doubts whether the middling classes are well affected; and the Church has been herself somewhat to blame for their lukewarmness. What has she done to keep their love? What has been done to guide their desires for knowledge, or to provide them with elevating relaxations, or to direct their tastes? Take, for instance, the host of young men who serve in shops and offices, who are at their desks and counters all the day; they have been left to pick up their principles as they may, to scramble towards their knowledge without direction. They have got their education without the help of the Church; their seminaries have been without clerical superintendence. Now, may not music be made to convey some notion of Church-fellowship to such as these? If we at all consider the mysteriously-associative principle in music, we see its peculiar fitness and capacity for acting upon the middling classes, for giving them some sense of Christian fellowship through a common taste dedicated to the Church. The very associative or social principle we allude to seems to point out its value as a spiritual agency; such a mysterious power of attracting men towards each other, of creating fellowships, as if by some secret charm, seems designed to forward the object of the one great Fellowship. It must be the duty of the Church, in striving to promote a corporate life and feeling, to use all incorporating influences. If the stones that lie in the fields may be gathered up and raised into temples of God, and fashioned into most harmonious forms, how much more may sounds that are in the world, that touch like lightning a vast multitude of souls, be made to bind that multitude together in a holy brotherhood through a common sense holily used. Indeed we might extend this view, and see the value of this associativeness in music among all classes, if it were felt and used by the Church, instead of its being resigned, as it is, to the world, and abused by it. We are accustomed to hear complaints of the associative power of music; and parents are apt to regret the gift of music in their children, because it mates them with unsuitable or dissolute friends, because it brings them into unequal friendships, into company unfitted for their rank, and only likely to lead them into vicious ways. We hear daily of men of the

highest rank consorting with opera-singers and the like, being drawn by the common love of music into a hurtful and degrading familiarity with a class of persons commonly so dissolute in their lives; and in people of less exalted rank we see friendships formed through music of an equally hurtful character. How many are ruined, both in their temporal and spiritual state, through the agency of tavern glee-clubs and suchlike meetings! Such spectacles cause men to grieve over the very gift of music; and, seeing the associative principle turned to evil, they forget, in its perversion, that it may be made as powerfully to bind men into good brotherhoods. This associativeness must be meant for good; and if the Church sought to develope it in her own great cause, if she might, in schools and societies of Church music, give vent to the passion for music which now breaks out in wrong directions, we might have to glory in a gift capable of uniting us together to our edification.

A happy thing it would be for the Church if, by any means, by any system of instruction a general knowledge of music could be diffused, and that knowledge dedicated to the glory of God. Our whole Church service, whether in cathedrals or parish churches, would be invested with a warmth, a sublimity, an impressiveness now unknown to it, for the capacities of the liturgy are hardly known. Then the choirs might be filled with devout and serious men, and we should have devotion and reverence combined with musical skill and knowledge. It is now difficult to obtain this combination—to find good men who are good singers. We suffer daily from this difficulty; even cathedrals, which give the highest remuneration, suffer from the presence of undevotional lay clerks, who have skill in singing, or from devotional lay clerks who are musically incompetent. Often indeed are musical qnalifications more inquired into than moral fitness; at best, from the scarcity of knowledge, and the little room for selection, the alternative lies between a musical service ill performed by good men, or well performed by careless ones. If there were more knowledge, there would be more room for selection. Serious persons would be found who would glory in having such a ministration in the Church, and would bring devoutness of mind, without diminishing the musical excellence of the service. And besides the regular choirs being composed of serious men, it would be possible to increase them, at any rate on Sundays, and other holy days, by a large body of volunteers. This is what we want; we want numbers in our cathedrals and larger churches to give due effect to the service, and to have a sufficient number we must have volunteers. What are twenty voices in a chorus in a cathedral? We want a hundred at least. And why should

not a hundred voluntary singers be found in our large towns, ready to submit themselves to the organist's control. At Leeds we believe a considerable portion of the choir is composed of volunteers, and these of different ranks in life. Sublime beyond all expression would be our liturgy if it were illustrated by the combined melody of heart and voice, issuing from a multitude of devout worshippers. We should soon cease to complain of the length of the service. Many parts would be sung that are now unsung, and that lose in impressiveness from the want of music; thus the psalms, designed for music (where there was daily prayer), might be chanted in all the larger churches. With a more general knowledge of music we might hope to hear the hymns in the Communion Service sung, at any rate in all cathedrals. At present they are either not sung at all, or are sung only by the non-communicants, that is, by the boys; and thus we have but the treble part; we have never seen, as we ought to have seen, the whole body of lay clerks communicating; and when one or two have occasionally shown their seriousness, they have disrobed themselves of their surplices, and neglected to glorify God in the most holy of all services, with the offering of their voice. Imperfectly, however, as these hymns are sung, they are even now intensely affecting, and we have seen many melted into tears as the music sounded through the church.

We might hope, too, occasionally to hear portions of the Burial Service sung. He who has once heard the effect of music at such a time, will never forget it. We once saw the member of a cathedral laid in his grave. When the music rose, a holy awe instantly filled and almost overpowered the congregation.

We have not entered into the question of plain-tune, but have left that gradually to work its own way; neither have we ventured to draw distinctions between cathedral and parochial service, to point out the proprieties in each, to say what ought to be sung in the one, and not sung in the other. We have left such subjects to abler hands, and have contented ourselves with a few plain and practical remarks, in the fervent hope that they may contribute, in their degree, to the great cause of Church music, which is no less a thing than the glorifying of God in the church with one of his own choice and most mysterious gifts.

P.S. Since these pages were written we have been glad to find that in the new theological department of King's College, London, where students are to be prepared for holy orders, the study of music is expressly insisted on. In our National Schools also, in many districts, the same study has been already introduced, and we saw the following paragraph in a recent number of "The

Times." "It is stated that under the authority of some of the heads of two of the Hon. Societies of the inns of court, a system of class-singing is about to be introduced amongst members of the Inner and Middle Temple, under the guidance of the organist and others of the Temple church, with a view to enable them to 'thoroughly understand and be able to take part in the choral service of the Church, whereby the amens, responses, versicles, psalms, and portions of the services, and even of the anthems, would be performed in a manner more consistent with the true character of public worship.' During the series of meetings of the classes, it is proposed that there shall be given a thorough course of instruction in the 'elements of music, management of the voice, art of reading music, and singing at sight.' It is also proposed that the method of chanting the services and anthems of the Church shall be fully explained, and the compositions of the first masters, ancient and modern, practised, including madrigals, choruses, glees," &c. This is indeed a cheerful paragraph; surely we may hope.

Art. VI.—1. *The Leading State Trials in Ireland, from the Year* 1784 *to* 1803, *with Introduction and Notes.* By T. M'Nevin, Esq., Barrister at Law. Dublin: Duffy. 1844.

2. *The United Irishmen, their Lives and Times.* By R. R. Madden. London. 1843.

3. *Report of Secret Committee in Ireland*, 1798.

A document of a very unusual character appeared in a recent number of the "Times." It was an address from magistrates residing in an Irish district, the North Riding of Tipperary, complaining of the state of lawless crime to which their country was reduced, and calling on their fellow-subjects in Great Britain to aid them in obtaining from the legislature and government such remedial measures as the circumstances seemed imperatively to demand. The document was subscribed by fifty-one justices of the peace, including Lord Dunally, chairman of the meeting from which it issued, and the Custos Rotulorum of the county, the Honourable Francis Aldborough Prittie. The subscribers differed materially from each other in their views, political and religious; but there was one particular in which they agreed—they were all, we believe, without exception, resident landlords. The remonstrance of such a body of men came before the public with authority.

In addressing such an appeal to the public it might be said that the subscribers committed a violation of official etiquette. They passed over the Lieutenant of their own county, a long tried and able governor, the Earl of Donoughmore. They passed by the nobleman who holds the name, if he do not wield the power, of Her Majesty's Lieutenant in Ireland. And they passed over the British cabinet, and Sir Robert Peel. It is, however, to be remembered, that this somewhat irregular and democratic procedure was not adopted, until applications sanctioned by usage had proved unsuccessful. The Tipperary magistrates had solicited aid and redress in the proper form, and from the constituted authorities; and it was not until the exactments of decorum had been duly and fruitlessly complied with, that, in the last instance, they appealed to the people. They did not show that they had lost confidence in the government, until it had become manifest that government wanted either the will or the power to help them.

They had another excuse for their public appeal, if, after their previous procedures, excuse was necessary. Within the limits of the North Riding of Tipperary, and in the space of six months, there had been sixteen murders perpetrated, sixteen murders attempted, and fifty-two cases of what might well be termed murderous assaults, such as firing into dwelling-houses, forcible attempts to take arms, &c. &c. A catalogue of crime like this furnishes ample excuse for some want of ceremony.

But it must be admitted that the subscribing Tipperary magistrates have exposed themselves to an imputation more grave than that of an offence against etiquette. They appear unable to discern, or unwilling to acknowledge, the merit of the policy against which they have been so daring as to remonstrate. They have asked for protection against the incendiary and assassin, and have presumed to think that the government and legislature could ensure what they ask for, by adopting measures wise and benevolent, suited to the emergency, and conceived in the spirit of the constitution: they were not to be taught that the measures they proposed were repugnant to the policy of Sir Robert Peel's administration, and were, accordingly, objectionable. It had been gravely propounded in various discussions with functionaries under the right honourable Baronet, that protection was not to be attained in Ireland by any practicable change in the existing laws. Where a people have a bias in favour of assassination, law cannot afford security. In an extreme case of this nature, loyal men must have patience. As soon as the character of the Celts in Ireland has undergone the beneficial change to be wrought in it by the policy which is now providing for them colleges and priests, they will have recourse to activities less pernicious than those in which their energies are now exerted; meanwhile, they must not be rudely interfered with. It might abate the graciousness of the Peel policy to proceed vigorously against an offence to which certain of the tribes of Munster seem to have a constitutional proneness. Such, in substance, appears to be the explanation of that policy of forbearance under which crime so banefully flourishes. The Tipperary magistrates appear not to have been convinced by this reasoning, or satisfied with the decision recommended by it. They have appealed to the common sense of mankind, and to the true hearts of the British people. How their appeal may speed, is yet to be seen; it does not appear that they have been punished for contumacy in making it. They retain still the commissions of the peace; nor does it appear to be the intention of Government to displace them.

In the north of Ireland, too, it would seem as if the power to dismiss and insult upright and independent magistrates were to be

henceforth less capriciously exercised. The dismissal of Mr. Watson has not been followed up; and yet his advice—the advice for which he was superseded—has been extensively adopted. Because that gentleman recommended the reorganization of the Orange Society in his own county, he was deprived of the commission of the peace, and accused of an endeavour to revive an illegal confederation. Since the day on which this severity was inflicted on Mr. Watson, his advice has been repeated by other magistrates—other magistrates have acted upon it—the Orange Society has been reorganized, or is in progress of reorganization, in Down, in Antrim, in Derry, in Armagh, in Tyrone, in Fermanagh, in Monaghan, in Cavan—and although many justices of the peace have taken active part in this vast movement, and although the Irish Government has been fully apprised of their exertions to revive the "illegal society," we hear no more of dismissals. Why is this? Does the Government persist in thinking the society what Lord Heytesbury was indiscreet enough to pronounce it? Why not persevere in its career of dismissals? Has it learned to correct its rash and mistaken judgment? Has it learned that the Orange Society is strictly legal? Why not avow that it is better advised, and add graciousness to the avowal, by restoring the excellent magistrate whom it had "ignorantly" superseded?

We must not look for too much. It is something to see the Irish government halt in "the road to ruin," even though they do not yet seem preparing to retrace their steps. The dismissal of Mr. Watson was, manifestly, a notice that the Orange confederation was not to be revived. In the non-interference with Lord Enniskillen, and the many who have acted with him, this injudicious or inopportune notice seems to have been withdrawn. Lord Heytesbury has, perhaps, by this time, consulted history for impartial testimony respecting the confederation he too rashly condemned, and has acquired a knowledge of his error. He has, probably, reflected that the Government which cannot venture upon measures for checking the activities, or arresting the progress of that baleful confederacy, which would make the land he is appointed to rule over, a wilderness, ought not to be rashly precipitate in destroying a society, which has true conservatism as the great end of its organization. He cannot abridge the assassins' vocation—he cannot break up the conspiracy which works out its ends by murder—and, conscious of his impotency for good, perhaps he has arrived at the conclusion, that to persevere in a blind hostility against the Orange institution, might possibly be to abuse his power for evil.

The truth is, that where such confederacies as the Repeal Association are openly permitted, and conspiracies like the Rib-

bon Society evade the law, it should be regarded as a natural and necessary compensation, that associations for good should also be organized. The rule by which other countries may be judged is wholly inapplicable to Ireland. Where there is correspondence and harmony between opinion and law, law should be supreme,—the whole people should constitute one society,—and he who attempted to divide them into adverse knots and parties should suffer the punishment of an incendiary. It is otherwise where a law, conceived in the spirit of indulgence, which good subjects may claim, is extended also to those who yield to it only a prudential and reluctant submission; where the people to be governed consists of two classes widely discriminated, the one composed of those who wish well to existing institutions, the other of those who desire that the institutions of the country be overturned. In such a state of things, a free constitution, and an indulgent administration of its laws, enable and encourage the disaffected to conspire, and thus, it may be said, compel the loyal to associate. The government which would interdict such association, while refusing to adapt the laws to the emergency, makes itself a partisan, and chooses its side, in opposition to good subjects, in alliance with adversaries to them and to the state. This desperate alliance the Irish government has narrowly escaped the guilt of forming; we hope it may escape the evil consequences of having appeared to contemplate the formation of it; and we would gladly offer any information in our power which might have the effect of a warning against the fatal error of thinking to compensate supineness or timidity towards enterprises which cover with flimsy pretexts purposes of massacre and treason, by exercising a most unconstitutional severity towards an association censurable, if it were censurable, in the judgment of the impartial and unprejudiced, for nothing worse than "exuberance of loyalty."

It has been very usual of late years to describe the Protestants of Ireland as persons possessed by a spirit of intolerance; and, whenever it was designed to render them especially odious, to describe them as an Orange faction. It is sufficiently intelligible that such a name should harm them in the judgment or opinion of enemies to British connexion; but that it would have prejudiced them in the esteem of England, was a result which could not so readily be anticipated. That result, however, has followed; and such has been the success of persevering and unscrupulous calumny, that the mass of Englishmen, even of English readers, have been influenced to regard the Orange Association of Ireland as only one of the many intemperate and intolerant factions, by which that unhappy country has been

afflicted. But this is a favourable judgment. Many there are who affect to pronounce the Orange Society the worst, pre-eminently, of all the Irish factions,—*the* one, indeed, which should be responsible for the mal-practices of all the others, whom its insolent and menacing demeanour has called into existence.

The Orangemen of Ireland may have been, on various occasions, provoked into intemperance and indiscretion; but they have been almost uniformly chargeable with one great error, of which they are now paying the penalty,—they were never industrious in disabusing the public mind of false impressions. Had they been careful for their reputation, as they should have been, with such a cause as theirs, and with such testimony as truth enabled them to command, slander would not have triumphed over them. They thought they could have lived calumny down, —it has brought them low, and has rendered it a matter of no common difficulty for those who would befriend them, as persons wronged and oppressed, to distinguish their case, as it should really be stated, from the malevolent misrepresentations of their adversaries.

The first Orange Lodge in Ireland was formed on September the 21st, in the year 1795, and was a sequel to a rude but sanguinary encounter between a Roman Catholic party, organized under the name of Defenders, and a body of Protestants, whom they assailed under exceedingly discreditable circumstances. Our account of this affair we shall take from historians whose bias cannot be a matter of doubt. The subjoined passage is extracted from the "Pieces of Irish History," published in New York, in the year 1807, by William James M'Nevin, a Roman Catholic and a United Irishman. The account is chargeable with inaccuracies, which we shall find it necessary to correct; but we give it, in the first instance, in the words of the writer.

"In the province of Ulster, the county of Armagh and its borders exhibited a scene of more melancholy disturbances and more abominable oppressions than had afflicted or disgraced the rest of Ireland. The religious animosities that had raged so violently in 1793, appeared to have been subdued by the combined efforts of *liberal Catholics and dissenters, by the unremitting exertions of the United Irishmen of that day, and by the conciliatory sentiments which flowed from the press, as far as it was in the same interests*[1]. The press, however, was subsequently reduced almost to silence; and the recent coercive statutes

[1] The reader will not be at a loss to draw the natural inference from this remarkable passage. The "liberals," the United Irishmen, and the press in their interest, which could exert no influence except on its own party, succeeded in calming the troubles of 1793. The "illiberal" or loyal party were, accordingly, not the disturbers. As soon as the adverse party was induced to leave them unmolested, the country had peace.

had nearly annihilated all public efforts by united, or even liberal Irishmen, on any subject of general politics, except during the transitory administration of Lord Fitzwilliam. The barriers to the revival of those animosities being thus broken down, they again desolated the country with augmented fury. The Peep-o'-Day Boys, who originally pretended only to enforce the popery laws, by depriving Catholics of their arms, now affected more important objects. They claimed to be associated for the support of a Protestant government, and a Protestant succession, which they said were endangered by the increased power of the Catholics in the state, and they therefore adopted the name of *Orangemen*, to express their attachment to the memory of that prince to whom they owed those blessings. With this change of name, they asserted they had also gained an accession of strength; for the Peep-o'-Day Boys only imagined they were supported by the law of the land, in their depredations on their Catholic neighbours; but the Orangemen boasted a protection greater than even that of law—the connivance and concealed support of those who were bound to see it fairly administered. Thus emboldened, and as they alleged, reinforced, they renewed their ancient persecutions; but not content with stripping Catholics of arms, they now went greater lengths than they had ever done before, in adding insult to injury, sometimes by mocking the solemnities of their worship, and at others, even by firing into the coffins of the dead on their way to sepulture.

"The Catholics were by no means inclined to submit with tameness to these outrages. The Defender system had included nearly all of that persuasion in the lower ranks, and scarcely any others were to be found in the neighbourhood. They seized some opportunities of retaliating, and thus restored to Defenderism in that part of the country its original character of a religious feud. These mutual irritations still increasing, at length produced open hostilities. An affray near Lough-Brickland, on the borders of the counties of Down and Armagh, and another at the fair of Lough-Gall, preceded and led to a more general engagement, in the month of August, at a place called the Diamond, near Portadown, in the county of Armagh. For some days previous to this, both parties had been preparing and collecting their forces; they seized the different passes and roads; had their advanced posts, and were in some measure encamped and hutted. No steps, however, were taken by the magistrates of the country; nor, as far as can be inferred from any visible circumstances, even by government itself, to prevent this religious war, publicly levied and carried on, in one of the most populous, cultivated and highly improved parts of the kingdom; nay, more, the party which provoked the hostilities, and which the event has proved to have been the strongest, boasted of being connived at, for its well-known loyalty and attachment to the constitution.

"Whatever may have been the motives for this inaction, certain it is, that both parties assembled at the Diamond, to the amount of several thousands. The Defenders were the most numerous, but the Orangemen had immense advantage in point of preparation and skill, many of them having been members of the old volunteer corps, whose arms and

discipline they still retained, and perverted to very different purposes, from those that have immortalized that body. The contest, therefore, was not long or doubtful; the Defenders were speedily defeated, with the loss of some few killed and left on the field of battle, besides the wounded, whom they carried away.

"After this, in consequence of the interference of a Catholic priest and of a country gentleman, a truce between both parties was agreed upon, which was unfortunately violated in less than twenty-four hours. The two bodies that had consented to it for the most part dispersed; the district, however, in which the battle was fought being entirely filled with Orangemen, some of them remained embodied, but the Catholics returned home. In the course of next day, about seven hundred Defenders from Keady, in a remote part of the county, came to the succour of their friends, and, ignorant of the armistice, attacked the Orangemen, who were still assembled. The associates of the latter being on the spot, quickly collected again, and the Defenders were once more routed. Perhaps this mistake might have been cleared up, and the treaty renewed, if the resentment of the Orangemen had not been fomented and cherished by persons to whom reconciliation of any kind was hateful. The Catholics, after this transaction, never attempted to make a stand, but the Orangemen commenced a persecution of the blackest dye. They would no longer permit a Catholic to exist in the county. They posted up on the cabins of those unfortunate victims this pithy notice, 'To hell or Connaught,' and appointed a limited time in which the necessary removal of persons and property was to be made. If after the expiration of that period the notice had not been entirely complied with, the Orangemen assembled, destroyed their furniture, burnt their habitations, and forced the ruined family to fly elsewhere for shelter. So punctual were they in executing their threats, that after some experiments, none were found rash enough to abide the event of non-compliance. In this way, upwards of seven hundred Catholic families in one county were forced to abandon their farms, their dwellings, and their properties, without any process of law, and even without any alleged crime, except their religious belief be one[2]."

In the above passage, there are some scattered fragments of truth; and there are falsehoods so daring, that we would gladly believe them unconscious. There is something like truth in the account of the Diamond fight, and an air of frankness in recording the truce-breaking by which it was signalized. We cannot give similar praise to the vain attempt at excusing it. To imagine it possible that seven hundred men could march from a distance of twelve or fourteen miles, through the county of Armagh, without receiving an intimation that a truce had been made, transcends ordinary credulity, and could hardly be expected to find entertainment at this side of the Atlantic. The excuse, it is not uncharitable to surmise, was designed to take effect where the "Pieces of Irish History" was published. There is something

[2] Pieces of Irish History, p. 112.

of truth, too, in the description of the state of Armagh; and there was a foundation for the report of cruelties perpetrated against Roman Catholics; but there is much exaggeration in the description and the report, and there is utter falsehood in the imputations cast upon the Orangemen. They neither were, nor could they have been, concerned in the perpetration of the outrages thus attributed to them.

The first Orange Lodge was formed on September 21, 1795, in consequence of that breach of faith or truce which caused the "battle of the Diamond." The "great increase and establishment" of the body "happened," as Mr. Plowden informs us, "in the year after." The outrages complained of had become so flagrant, or at least had been so loudly complained of in the preceding year, that a meeting of the magistrates was held in Armagh with a view to their suppression, in December, 1795. At that meeting several of the Orange body attended and subscribed resolutions, offering rewards for information against disturbers, and pledging themselves, to the utmost of their power, to punish and put them down. It is to confound two classes of persons altogether distinct, the Peep-o'-Day Boys and the original Orangemen, to suppose that the latter had any share in the excesses to which the disappearance of some Roman Catholic families from Armagh was attributed by Lord Gosford and the magistrates who subscribed his well-known resolutions[3]. The Peep-o'-Day Boys, should be regarded as distinct and separate, if not in some respects adverse, parties. The battle of the Diamond brought together into one body the classes of which the two were composed. Protestants of all descriptions took part in that engagement. A Protestant gentleman belonging to the Church of England had assisted at the treaty by which mutual hostilities were suspended, and was fired upon from an ambuscade of Defenders when returning to his home. When the second attack was made on the village, the minds of all Protestants were prepared to repel force by force, and it was after the successful issue

[3] "The Orange Association should not be confounded, as it has often invidiously been, with the mutual and disgraceful outrages which prevailed in the county Armagh many years preceding, between the lowest class of Presbyterians, under the denomination of Peep-of-Day Boys, and the Roman Catholics as Defenders."—Musgrave's Irish Rebellion, 79.

39. "The Orange Society did not commence till 1795? No.

43. "Did it spring out of the Peep-of-Day Boys? No.

47. "Did you consider the Orange Society as a continuation of these societies? No.

48. "They were opposed both to the Peep-of-Day Boys and the Defenders. They were opposed to all the disturbers of peace in the country. I never conceived them to be connected with any other society."—Lieut.-Col. Verner, M.P., Select Com. on Orange Lodges, p. 5.

3655. "I have understood originally the Orangemen were composed of Churchmen, and I have heard that afterwards Dissenters were admitted, and I believe that it was so."—Earl of Gosford, ibid. p. 258.

of the struggle, that Protestants of the Church of England determined to form that union which has since subsisted with very great benefit to the country, and through much evil repute, it must be confessed, to the members of the association. That they are not to be regarded as the authors or instruments of the persecution with which the Protestants of Armagh have been charged, is plain from the facts of the case, no less than from the principles of the Orange institution. There was no evidence against them. They were in numbers too limited to have the force requisite for persecution. The gentlemen of influence who assisted in forming the Orange Society, or who joined it while yet feeble and immature, exerted themselves to the uttermost to detect the evil-doers and bring them to punishment. Mr. Plowden, however, has furnished, in the form of a condemnation, a testimony to the Orange system, which, offered by a writer of his principles and bias, may well be regarded as decisive. We give it in his own words:—

"It is unquestionable, that the Presbyterians generally abhorred the principles of the Orangemen; but it is also certain that many of them were sworn into these societies. They were however chiefly of the lower orders, who depended for their subsistence upon their landlords. Several persons of great landed interest in those parts *insisted upon their Protestant tenants and labourers becoming Yeomen and Orangemen.* Such were *the Marquiss of Hertford, Marquiss of Abercorn, Lord Northland, the Earl of Londonderry, Mr. Cope, Messrs. Brownlow and Richardson, Members for the County of Armagh,* and other possessors of great landed estates in Ulster."

Such patronage is inexplicable on an hypothesis less favourable to the Orange Society, than one which acquits it of all participation in these nocturnal outrages and disorders, by which, the magistrates assembled in December 1795, declared that the county of Armagh had been convulsed and dishonoured, and by which, they affirmed, a very great number of innocent persons had most grievously suffered.

But whoever were the actors in this dreadful persecution, is it not, at all events, clear that Roman Catholics were punished for the cause of their religion? By no means. There was a crime of a far different description for which they have suffered, and in the consciousness of which they may have perhaps inflicted punishment upon themselves. To form a right judgment upon this matter, it will be necessary te understand the character and principles of one of the parties engaged in the battle of the Diamond, and we shall cite, as witnesses and authorities in the case, writers whose opportunities of knowledge cannot be denied,

and whose testimony will not be rejected on account of their prejudices. We shall cite Theobald Wolfe Tone, and one who laboured not less zealously, although perhaps more obscurely, in the same cause, Denis Taafe.

"For the Catholics, from what has been said of their situation, it will appear that little previous arrangement would be necessary to ensure their unanimous support of any measure which held out to them a chance of bettering their condition; yet they also have an organization, commencing about the same time (A. D. 1791) with the clubs last mentioned, but composing Catholics only. Until within these few months, this organization baffled the most active vigilance of the Irish government, unsuccessfully employed to discover its principles, and, to this hour, they are, I believe, unapprised of its extent. The fact is, that in June last it embraced the whole peasantry of the provinces of Ulster, Leinster, and Connaught, threefourths of the nation; and I have little doubt but it has since extended into Munster, the remaining province. These men, who are called Defenders, are completely organized on a military plan, divided according to their respective districts, and officered by men chosen by themselves; the principle of their union is implicit obedience to the orders of those whom they have elected for their generals, and whose object is the emancipation of their country, the subversion of English usurpation, and bettering the condition of the wretched peasantry of Ireland. The eyes of this whole body, which may be said, almost without a figure, to be the people of Ireland, are turned, with the most anxious expectation, to France for assistance and support. The oath of their union recites, 'That they will be faithful to the united nations of France and Ireland,' and several of them have already sealed it with their blood. I suppose there is no instance of a conspiracy, if a whole people can be said to conspire, which has continued for so many years as this has done, where the secret has been so religiously kept, and where, in so vast a number, so few traitors have been found.

"This organization of the Defenders embraces *the whole peasantry of Ireland, being Catholics.* There is also a further organization of the Catholics, which is called the General Committee, and to which I have already alluded. This was a representative body chosen by the Catholics at large, and consisting of the principal merchants and traders, the members of professions, and a few of the remaining Catholic gentry of Ireland[4]."

"The Defenders after their association had changed its type, were bound together by oaths, obviously drawn up by illiterate men, different in various places, all promising secrecy, and specifying whatever grievance was in such place most felt, and best understood. Tithes, therefore, were in all of them very prominent. The views of these men were far from being distinct; although they had a national notion,

[4] Tone's Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 188.

that 'something ought to be done for Ireland,' yet they were all agreed, that whatever was to be done should be accomplished by force of arms. They, therefore, formed themselves upon a military system, and, in order to procure arms, assembled by night, to take them from the houses of those who they conceived would be eventually their enemies.

"These disturbances attracted the attention of the House of Lords early in 1793, and a secret committee was appointed to inquire into their causes, to endeavour to discover their promoters, and to prevent their extension[5]."

Thus, it would appear, that the battle of the Diamond was not an engagement between two classes of disorderly subjects of the British crown, but between subjects, such as they were, on the one hand, and sworn traitors to the British crown, on the other. The Defenders were persons who contemplated an insurrection in which something was to be done for Ireland "by force," and, to entitle themselves to foreign aid in this anticipated struggle they had sworn fidelity to France. Such, on testimony not to be gainsaid, were the Defenders, and such, on the testimony of the same witness, were all the Roman Catholics of Armagh, those upon whom the process of extermination is said to have taken effect, as well as those who, notwithstanding the lawlessness of the times, and the treasonable engagements in which they had become implicated, still abode in their possessions. Now it has ever appeared to us, we confess, a very remarkable peculiarity in that well-known address, and those resolutions of Lord Gosford's to which we have alluded, that while they tell of threatenings and expulsions, they do not describe a single case in which an injured individual is named, nor do they afford the slightest reason for believing that the dreadful persecution of which they speak had been rendered more odious even by a single instance of murder. The Tipperary magistrates affirm, that in one half year, and within the limits of half their county, sixteen murders have been perpetrated, and sixteen more have been attempted; and this frightful sacrifice of life has been caused by the desire to recover or to retain possession of some portion of land, or else to revenge the loss of it. Such are the sacrifices offered up in Munster to the agrarian principle, while we are given to understand that some hundred families in Armagh could quietly go forth from their possessions, because threatenings were uttered against them if they dared to remain. They could boldly meet their adversaries in arms whenever an occasion for fighting offered, from January 1791 to September 1795; and after

[5] An Impartial History of Ireland, by D. Taafe, vol. iv. 489.

the disastrous autumnal equinox of that year, they became changed into so lamb-like a timidity, that persecution had only to dictate what it desired; they who, of late, were forward to take the field, and dare all hazards to achieve the liberation and aggrandizement of Ireland, were now ready, at the word of command, to fly from their homes, because a ruffian menace (of some dastard, perhaps, like themselves) had power to quell them. We are not disposed to believe in such a change of character, especially as there is a simpler mode of explaining the change of conduct. The Roman Catholics who left their homes in the county of Armagh, fled from justice, not from the persecution of a wild rabble. They knew themselves to have been implicated in a treasonable conspiracy, and had reason to fear that their guilt would speedily be discovered. That they had rendered themselves liable to the severest penalties of the law, is plain from the testimonies we have already cited; that the secrets of their conspiracy had transpired, and were in the possession of government, is manifest from the fact, that the trials of the Defenders commenced in December 1795. Is it not, therefore, natural to conclude that the bloodless withdrawal of numbers from the county of Armagh should be ascribed rather to the necessities caused by the anticipated pursuit of justice, than to the persecutions of a "lawless rabble?"

The oath taken by Defenders to be true to the united nations of Ireland and France, we have already noticed. A more odious obligation of this conspiracy became revealed during the progress of the State Trials. It was an engagement to massacre or exterminate the whole Protestant population of Ireland. To this there was, unhappily, too conclusive evidence given on the trials. In one instance, it appeared, that the design was imprudently disclosed, and that it influenced one of the conspirators to denounce the projects of his associates. There was a young man, a mechanic, who had been brought up as a Protestant, but had become infected with the revolutionary and infidel principles of republican France. In his estate of unbelief, he was practised upon by an emissary of the Defenders, who introduced him into the society as a Roman Catholic, the new recruit consenting to adopt the name, inasmuch as he had an equal indifference towards all religions. He was not prepared, however, for a disclosure that all Protestants were to be massacred, and as soon as that wicked purpose was made known to him, he gave secret information of it to a friend, through whose instrumentality he was finally produced as a witness against the conspirators. A passage or two from the examination of this witness will be sufficient as evidence on this painful subject.

"William Lawler cross-examined by Mr. Curran.

"After the conversation with Hart, you told Mr. Cowan? Yes. Was that not a conversation in which he communicated to you the bad purposes of the meetings? I did not like the idea of massacring all the Protestants.

"When was the first time you knew of their bad designs? I knew if they were to rise that some persons were to be destroyed, but I did not think that they would destroy all the Protestants [6].

"Examined by Mr. Saurin.

"Witness asked Mr. Weldon, was he not afraid to carry those papers about him; he said no, for he was never searched, and did not care who saw the large one, the small one was the principal, the other was only a test *on account of swearing the soldiers.* Brady asked if there was any one to lead them? Weldon said there *was one in the north,* but did not mention his name [7].

"Examined by Mr. Kells.

"He said, he met the prisoner at Nowlan's, in Drury-lane; it was on Sunday, the 23rd of August, after the meeting at Stoneybatter; it was a society of Defenders; there were more than twelve at the meeting; it was about seven in the evening. The prisoner asked witness if Coffey and Dry were not Protestants. Witness answered, he believed they were; the prisoner said he would not sit in company with them; the reason the prisoner asked him was, because he was acquainted with them both. The prisoner asked witness what religion he was of? Witness answered he was a Roman; the reason he said so was, because Brady told him when he went to be sworn, to say he was a Roman, for that they had an objection to admit Protestants. Witness asked the prisoner his reason for asking the question so many times; prisoner said because he would not sit in company with a Protestant; that the night before the Defenders were to have risen, but on account of the harvest not being got in it was deferred; for if the harvest should be destroyed, they would be starved, but as soon as it was got in, they would rise upon the Protestants, and put them to death; and that the forts would be attacked at the same time; he meant by the forts the different garrisons in Ireland. The prisoner said he would call a committee of twelve men, and that Lockington should be made a prisoner, and they would then consult *what death they should put him to, for having brought Protestants among them* [8]."

The state of alarm in which Protestants of the humbler classes lived, if it could be called to live, at this time, may be judged of

[6] M'Nevin's Leading State Trials, p. 328. [7] Ibid. p. 499.
[8] Ibid. p. 321.

from evidence given by Thomas Smith, who had enlisted into the artillery to escape danger, after he had been influenced, by his fears, to enter into the conspiracy of the Defenders, and to conceal his religion :—

"Thomas Smith cross-examined by Mr. Kells.

"How long have you been in the artillery? Since the 15th of April, 1795.

"Was it before or after you were enlisted you were sworn a Defender? Before.

"Were you intimately acquainted with Glennan before you went into the artillery? I was.

"Did Glennan hold any communication with you about going into the artillery? I will tell you the reason I went in. I was a Protestant all my life, and so was my father, and grandfather, since King William's time. I was obliged to hide my Bible and Prayer-book, and I consulted with my wife, and determined to go into the army to practise my profession as usual. I was obliged to make my daughter deny that she was a Protestant born, and make her say she went to mass."

(Here the witness was examined by the Court.)

"When did you hear of their intentions? In February 1795. What did you hear? They were talking in Connor's house—we expected every day a massacre and rebellion was to break out—*no Protestant was to be left alive* . . . . . They were to have no king, they said—we will recover our estates, sweep clean the Protestants, kill the lord lieutenant, and leave none alive [9]."

Such were the purposes of the Defenders, a body who embraced in their organization the mass of the Roman Catholic peasantry in at least the province of Ulster. They were formidable, too, from the compactness of their organization as well as for their evil designs and principles :—

"Their measures appear to have been concerted and conducted with the utmost secrecy, and a degree of regularity and system not usual in persons of such mean condition, and as if directed by men of a superior rank [1]."

But it is to be borne in mind that the Defenders constituted only one of the bodies organized for treasonable purposes in Ireland. In that memoir of T. W. Tone, from which we have already given an extract, we find the following summary :—

"I have now stated the three modes of organization which exist in Ireland.

[9] M'Nevin's Leading State Trials, p. 466.
[1] Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Lords in 1793.

"1. The Dissenters, with some of the most spirited and enlightened of the Catholics, under the name of *United Irishmen*, whose central point is Belfast, the capital of Ulster.

"2. The Defenders, forming the great body of the Catholic peasantry, amounting to 3,000,000 of people, and who cover the entire face of the country.

"3. The General Committee of the Catholics, representing the talents and property of that body, possessing a very great influence every where in Ireland, and especially deciding the movements of the capital.

"I hazard nothing in asserting that these three bodies are alike animated with an ardent desire for the independence of Ireland, an abhorrence of British tyranny, and a sincere attachment to the cause of the French Republic; and, what is of very great consequence, they have a perfect good understanding and communication with each other, (that is to say, the leaders,) so that, on any great emergency, there would be no possible doubt of their mutual co-operation. Many of the most active members of the General Committee, for example, are also in the clubs of the United Irishmen; many of the officers of the Defenders, particularly those at the head of their affairs, are also either members of those clubs, or in unreserved confidence and communication with those who regulate and guide them. The central point of all this is undoubtedly Belfast, which influences, and which deserves to influence, the measures of all the others; and what I consider extremely singular, the leaders of the Defenders in Ulster, who are all Catholics, are in more regular habits of communication, and are more determined by the Dissenters of Belfast, than by their Catholic brethren of Dublin, with whom they hold much less intercourse[2]."

The opinion thus expressed by Tone seems to be countenanced by a letter addressed to him while he was in America, being dated Belfast, September 18, 1795, and signed R. S., the initials of Robert Simms mentioned in Tone's journal as one of the leaders of the United Irishmen. R. S., or Mr. Simms writes:—

"It is evident, from the general sentiments of the lower classes of the people, that it will be impossible Ireland can long remain in her present condition. They all look to the French, and consider them as fighting *their* battles. The organization which you were made acquainted with amongst the Catholics in this neighbourhood continues to increase, and has spread as far as Meath, and will, probably, go much further, which will certainly produce powerful means, if properly applied, but it will require great exertions to keep this organization from producing feuds among the different sects, *for the Presbyterians in general*, knowing nothing of their views and plans, look

[2] Life of T. W. Tone, vol. ii. 190. Washington, 1826.

on them with great jealousy. These exertions shall not be wanting, and let us hope the best[3]."

The spread of Defenderism in the army is alluded to in another letter, received also from a "United Irish leader in Belfast:"—

"R. is just returned from Dublin, where it is currently reported and generally believed that five or six thousand of the militia have taken the Defenders' oath. It is certain that a great many have[4]."

A letter "from one of the chief Catholic leaders in Dublin," now known to be the celebrated John Keogh, confirms the intelligence sent from Belfast as to the activity of the Defenders:—

"I saw our friend, P. Burrowes about an hour since; he was just returned from Naas, where he was employed by the Crown in prosecuting Defenders. Two of them are condemned to death; one, whose name is O'Connor, made a speech in defence of the people. Counsellor Burrowes considers these infatuated people as having enlisted men for the French, *in expectation of an invasion.* It was found that O'Connor swore many to be true to the French. This now appears to be the oath taken by all the Defenders[5]."

The oath to which allusion is here made was produced on the trials of the Defenders, in December 1795. It was as follows:—

"I, A. B., do, in presence of God, swear, of my own free will and accord, that I will be true to the present united states of F—— and I——, and every other kingdom, now in Christianity, as far as in my power lies, without hurting my soul or body, as long as they prove so to me. And more I do swear, that I will not go with any robber or thief, or any person who is suspected to defame our society in character whatsoever, or keep such people company, if to my knowledge I know it. And more I do swear, that I will be true to my committee and brothers; that is to say, in supporting the rights and privileges of the united states of the kingdom, now in brotherhood, or may be hereafter; and that I will not wrong any of my brothers to the value of twopence sterling, to my knowledge. And more I do swear, that I will not come as an evidence against any of my brothers in any cause whatsoever, except on a court-martial held by our committees, on pain of exclusion or death, whichsomever is deserving. And more I do swear, that I will not strike or ill-use a brother in any respect; and that if I see a brother struck or ill-used, I will aid and assist him as far as in my power lies, if in a just cause, if to my knowledge he is a brother; and all brothers is to live lovingly and friendly together, and to have no quarrels or disputes whatsoever, and he that does, is to be

[3] Life of Tone, vol. i. p. 284.
[4] Ibid. p. 290.
[5] Ibid. p. 292.

excluded as long as the committee thinks proper; and to avoid such things, you are not to play at any sort of gaming with any of your brothers for more than sixpence at one time. And more I do swear, that I will help to support a lawful well-inclined brother in all distresses whatsoever, as far as in my power lies, without hurting myself or my family; and that I will meet when and where my committee thinks proper, and spend what is agreeable to my committee and company, and that monthly, or as the committee thinks proper: and this article is according to the united states of the kingdom.

" Signed, by order or of the
head committee of

" *F. & J.*"

Although the language of this oath may not seem that of an accomplished writer, the substance of the engagement shows that it was contrived by persons of much prudence and information. In truth, it is the same in character and spirit (although more minute in detail) with the oaths in use among the various insurrectionary societies of the *south of Ireland*, from the time of the Whiteboy rising, in 1759, to that of this new type of Defenderism, commencing with the year 1790. It might not be without its use, if space permitted, to examine the various engagements taken by disturbers in Ireland, beginning with the accession of George III., and to show the leading principle in which they all unite. Those writers who argue that the disorders of that country are principally agrarian, would find little countenance for their opinion in the sworn obligations of the insurgents; and would, perhaps, if they reflected on such evidence, be brought to admit that the silence which almost universally prevails as to the grievances from which the various tumults are supposed to have arisen, is, to say the least of it, an incident which ought not to have been overlooked. We cannot afford to dwell upon it now, but think it not amiss to have bestowed on it this brief notice.

It will be felt that the state of Ireland was one of more than ordinary peril, when elements, thus various in their character, were combined for its destruction. The whole mass of the Roman Catholic population, the great majority of the Dissenters,—heads to plan treason and to direct insurrection on a scale which befitted war,—hearts and hands to carry out the preliminaries of rebellion by murder, " foul and unnatural,"—the terrors of Defenderism compelling peaceful subjects to seek shelter under the United Irish system,—the Government, by its long-continued inaction, almost excusing loyal men for thinking that it had betrayed them. And these evils, which may well seem sufficiently menacing, had many aggravations; among them

these two, the secrets of government were continually betrayed, and the army was subjected to influences so very seductive, that it could scarcely be depended on.

"It was at one of those meetings," writes Mr. Madden, "that the sergeants of two regiments then stationed in Dublin attended, *the men of one of which were then on duty* at the Castle, waiting the decision of the Committee; and, after a long debate, the decision was come to, to postpone the rising. One of the members, on whose authority the preceding account is given, conveyed the decision of the Committee to the persons in attendance at the door of the place of meeting; and the emphatic reply of the latter was (with the addition of an oath), 'Then all is lost[6].'"

"The law officers of the crown, at the State Trials, were often astonished at the discovery of previous examinations of the approvers, and the knowledge of their disclosures, which enabled Mr. Curran to take advantage of any discrepancy in the evidence[7]."

"It was no uncommon thing, in 1796, to meet General Lake at the parties of the prime mover of the United System, Mr. Wm. Sinclair, and at a later period, Col. Barber, and Lieut.-Gen. Nugent. There was a policy, it is said, in maintaining this kind of intercourse, as not a single movement of the troops, or an iota of information communicated by government to General Lake, but a sister of the Sinclairs, a young woman of considerable personal attractions and intelligence, was not[8] able to obtain from the General,—an officer more remarkable for his vanity and incapacity, than for any qualities or acquirements of another kind[9]."

Such was the state of parties in Ireland towards the close of the last century, and such, we would remind the reader, was the state, emphatically, of Ulster; the United Irish system embracing a majority of the Presbyterians; Defenderism numbering as its adherents almost the whole Roman Catholic population; spies upon the functionaries of government, both civil and military, in their offices as well as in society; and fear acting upon such hearts as it could quell among the well affected to make them

[6] Lives of United Irishmen, Second Series, vol. i. p. 137.

[7] Ibid. p. 118.

[8] This negative particle is manifestly superfluous, or else the "but" should be "which." It would appear that female influence promoted the interests of the Union in other forms than this in which Miss Sinclair rendered her brother's hospitalities useful. "The oath was administered to" (M'Nevin), observes Mr. Madden, "by the daughter of James Moore, of Thomas-street, the friend of Lord Edward Fitzgerald, a young lady then celebrated no less for her beauty than her devotion to the interests of the Union. That lady, now Mrs. Macready, lately informed the author, that several of her sex, to her own knowledge, were sworn members of the society. The oath had been administered to her by John Cormack, of Thomas-street."—Lives of United Irishmen, Second Series, vol. ii. p. 217.

[9] Lives of United Irishmen, Second Series, vol. ii. p. 425.

seek protection, where only it seemed attainable, in the ranks of a treasonable society.

And here we feel that our duty would not be faithfully discharged, if we did not enable the reader to form some notion of the atrocities by which this reign of terror was established and extended. We shall not pain him or ourselves by making numerous citations, but limit our extracts to two,—one from the evidence of a distinguished and upright member of parliament, Lieut.-Col. Verner, and the second from Mr. Madden's "Lives of the United Irishmen;" the former containing details of an inhuman outrage perpetrated by the Defenders; the other tending to show with what Draconic indifference offences against the Union were visited with treason's extremest rigour.

"*Select Committee on Orange Lodges*, April 7, 1835.

(Lieut.-Col. Verner, M.P.)

30.—"A gentleman of the name of Jackson died and demised his property to religious and charitable purposes, and required by his will that a Protestant colony should be established upon his property[1] in that part of the country; it adjoins the county of Louth. In attempting to do so, his agent was frequently shot at, and upon one occasion had a horse killed under him. Mr. Jackson required, by will, that there should be four schools established for the purpose of the education of the children of all denominations and persuasions. In the attempt to establish this colony, the persons who came to reside there were frequently threatened by the Roman Catholics, and told that they should not come into that part of the country. One of the schoolmasters had also been frequently threatened. One evening his house was entered; I am not sure whether the door was forced, or if he opened it at the persuasion of a neighbour[2]; a body of men came in. The man, aware from their threats what their object was, concealed his wife in the bed-curtains. They threw him down, put a cord round his neck, and forced his tongue out, which they cut off, and then cut off the joints of his fingers, joint by joint. His unfortunate wife screamed out; they took her, and cut off, with a blunt instrument, the joints of her fingers; they then cut off her breasts, seized her son[3], a boy of thirteen years old, cut out his tongue, and cut the calves off his legs. The unfortunate man asked if he had ever injured them; they replied no, but that this was the beginning of what all his sort might expect."

[1] "His demesne, consisting of 3000 acres, on which there were no tenants."—Musgrave's Irish Rebellions, p. 59, and note.

[2] It was at the persuasion of a neighbour, whose voice he knew.

[3] It was her brother, a boy of thirteen years old, who had come from Armagh that morning to see her.

The statement of Lieut.-Col. Verner corresponds with the more detailed account, published at the time, of the dreadful occurrence, by the trustees to the charity. They add, however, one circumstance which should not be overlooked.

"Shocking as this account is to human nature, *it is publicly exulted at in the parish;* and no person seems to think that any punishment will follow the commission of this most atrocious wickedness. So far were they from wishing to conceal it, that they proceeded on the road with torches, publicly, and in defiance of every body.

"There is every reason to dread the most alarming consequences from the effects of this transaction. The Protestants are every where in the greatest terror; and unless government affords them assistance, must leave the country, as this recent instance of inhumanity, and the threatenings thrown out against them, leave no doubt upon their minds of what the intentions must be against them[4]."

We should apologize for submitting to the reader a statement such as this, (one which we admit is too shocking to be produced on an ordinary occasion,) or rather, we should have spared the reader and ourselves the pain of producing it, if it were not of paramount necessity to show the nature of the influences by which Defenderism extended its empire.

The judicial inflictions of the United Irishmen had less, perhaps, of barbarism in their cruelty, but were not without their due share of terror. Their influence was upon witnesses, jurors, magistrates, people at large, and was made manifest in courts of justice as well as over the whole face of the country. We shall quote but a single passage to show the indifference with which the taking away of human life appears to have been contemplated; and this we shall borrow, not from the appalling statements of the Lord Chancellor Clare, or from any of the historians, whose bias is supposed not to have been favourable to the conspirators, but from Mr. Madden, the apologist, rather than the historian, of the United Irishmen. Mr. Madden, *in defence* of the parties accused of an organized system of assassination, cites the information he received from one of those parties, whose individual experience was, certainly, somewhat more than ordinarily suspicious:—

"James Hope, on the subject of the assassinations ascribed to the United Irishmen, informs me, that at the Society established at Craigurogan, they came to a resolution to the following effect: 'That any man who recommended or practised assassination of any person whomsoever, or however hostile to the Society, should be expelled[5].'"

[4] Musgrave's Irish Rebellions, p. 61.
[5] United Irishmen, Second Series, vol. i. 356.

At a Baronial Committee, held at Ballyclare, near Carrickfergus, James Hope and Joseph Williamson, proposed the resolution above named; it was seconded by William Orr (who was executed at Carrickfergus), who said on that occasion, a man who would recommend the killing of another was a coward, as well as a murderer.

"The resolution, however, was opposed by some of the Belfast men, and it did not pass at that meeting. But no Society or Committee gave a sanction to the practice of assassination[6]. The only persons Hope knew to have been assassinated, were M'Bride, an informer of Donegore, shot in North-street, Belfast, at Saw's Entry, in 1797; M'Clure, of Craigbally, supposed to be made away with in 1796, who suddenly disappeared, and was never more heard of; Harper, of the county Down, suspected to be an informer, shot at a bridge near Ballygowan, about three miles from Belfast; Newell, from Dublin, an informer, who was traced as far as Doah, about ten miles from Belfast; Philips, an excommunicated priest, from French Park, county Roscommon, who had sworn in a number of Defenders, had received a shilling a head from them, and subsequently had given information to Colonel King and Lord Dillon, and had several of the men thus sworn arrested. He then came to Belfast, but his character came before him; he was taken by a party of Defenders, about 1794; one of them (it was said) confessed he was present when they seized Philips, tried him on the spot, and condemned him,—they gave him time to pray,—then put leaden weights into his pockets, and drowned him at the paper-mill stream, close to the town. Henry Caghally, of county Derry, suspected of being an informer (but no proof of the fact); he got money to take him to America, but spent the money, and remained at home; he was then seized, brought to Templepatrick by a party who gave him drink, and then stabbed him in the breast and killed him. This was two miles from Templepatrick, on the Antrim road. Hope knows of no other instances of assassination ascribed, with any probability of truth, to the United Irishmen."

"Hope *knows* of no other instances." The instances, it may be said, are sufficiently numerous. They serve abundantly to explain some of those scenes in courts of justice, where faltering witnesses belied their examinations, and shrunk from identifying the accused. The Union had other resources, too, in the perjuries it exacted, when perjury could serve its turn.

"The following information, in connexion with this subject," writes Mr. Madden[7], "was given to me by a man, whose honesty and truth have a sort of proverbial currency in Belfast; by Israel Milliken, a

[6] Surely the negative of the Baronial Committee was an ample sanction.
[7] United Irishmen, vol. i. p. 355.

man not unacquainted with the 'full troubles' of that time, nor a mere spectator in that struggle. Milliken's statement gives an insight into the crimes to which men were driven in those times; men meeting perjury with perjury, and attempts on life, in the arrangement of the panel, and the drilling of the witnesses, with the taking of life by other modes and weapons.

"Joseph Cuthbert and John Boyce, and four other prisoners, in 1797, confined in Carrickfergus gaol, were put on their trial. The witness against them was one Lee, a pensioner, and also a pedlar, who had lodged the original information against this man before the trial came on, and who was drowned at Duneddery bridge, three miles from Antrim. Lee was then brought forward as a substitute for the pedlar, to swear against them; and prior to the trial, an attempt was also made on the life of Lee, who swore that Cuthbert and some others had fired at him. Lee had been set on by a captain, (M'Nevin.) The attorney for the prisoners was James M'Guiken. It was determined to get two *alibis*, to prove that the prisoners were of a masons' lodge, and had been at it all that evening on which the murder was said to have taken place. These two witnesses were sent to confer with M'Guiken before the trial; and on leaving him, one of them said it was evident that he (M'Guiken) was giving them advice that would cause them to break down. They, however, and all the prisoners' friends, thought that M'Guiken did this from stupidity, and not from dishonesty. The two witnesses were one John Sayers, a farmer, and the other was William M'Coe, a publican. Some years after, Sayers became dispirited, and repented of what he had done; he came to Israel Milliken, and told him he had no peace or comfort; that he had consulted several clergymen, but they gave no ease of mind. A person present, a friend of Israel's, recommended the man to take comfort; and inasmuch as he had not borne false witness *against* his neighbour, but *for* his neighbour, instead of causing the death, he had saved the lives of six men. These witnesses, on their examination, gave so circumstantial an account of the masonic toasts, songs, and proceedings, which they described on this occasion, that the witnesses quite carried the judge with them, and the prisoners were acquitted."

The machinery of the malcontents would not have been complete without a press, and accordingly a press was provided. Of this there were three principal organs; the *Northern Star*, published in Belfast, which had among its objects, as Tone avers, "to give a fair statement of what passed in France, whither every one turned his eyes[8];" the *Press*, printed in Dublin, and conducted by A. O'Connor, a member of the executive directory of the Irish Union, having for its object to vilify government, &c. &c., and

[8] Life, vol. i. p. 67.

the *Union Star*, of which we find the following notice in the Report of the Secret Committee, 1798[9].

"The *Union Star* appeared at irregular periods, was printed on one side of the paper to fit it for being pasted on walls, and frequently second editions were published of the same numbers. It chiefly consisted of names, and abusive characters of persons supposed to have been informers against United Irishmen, or active opposers of their designs; and to such lists were generally added the most furious exhortations to the populace to rise and take vengeance on their oppressors. Each number commences with the following words:—

"As the *Union Star* is an official paper, the managers promise the public that no characters shall be hazarded but such as are denounced by authority, as being the partners and creatures of Pitt, and his sanguinary journeyman, Luttrell.

"The *Star* offers to public justice the following detestable traitors, as spies and perjured informers.

"Perhaps some arm more lucky than the rest may reach his heart, and free the world from bondage[1]."

Such is an incomplete outline of the machinery of disaffection in Ireland at the close of the last century, previously to the outbreak of insurrection in the year 1798. It will be admitted that the instrumentality was very formidable; a pestilent press, assassins, false witnesses, spies in the government offices, and upon the movements, out of their houses, and in their houses, of all official persons, emissaries to corrupt the army,—and all these agencies at the command of a Directory engaged in treasonable correspondence with a foreign enemy; the United Irish system completed, having for its purpose to effect a separation from Great Britain, and establish a republic in Ireland; Defenderism completed, proposing a similar purpose, but holding as its own secret, (until events made it known,) utterly to exterminate Protestants from the country; all the members of these treasonable societies known to each other by secret signs and pass words, and all but those who were capable of thus making themselves known, exposed incessantly to systematic intimidation and outrage. Such a state of things demanded a wise and vigorous government, and such was the engrossing anxiety with which the British cabinet devoted itself to foreign affairs, that for a great length of time Ireland was abandoned to the care of official persons who were grossly incompetent to the emergency.

It was in this state of things the Orange Society was formed,

[9] Report from Com. of Secrecy, 1798.
[1] Appendix 27.

the first organized society within the century (the Peep-of-day Boys had no settled organization), which was, at the same time, political and exclusively Protestant. It was in its principle, as inquiry has by this time abundantly established, purely defensive, enjoining upon its members to respect the religious opinions of all men, and to protect, so far as their power should extend, all who were upright and loyal. Its progress at first was slow, few or none but members of the Church of England giving in their adhesion; but when it was found, that wherever a lodge was formed, loyal men were able to protect themselves, and the lawless became more cautious, and crime less frequent, the Orange Society grew in favour, and extended itself. After some time, persons who had sworn to the engagements of the United Irishmen, because their crime promised them protection, learning that they could ensure a more honest defence, renounced their old associates, and entered into the Orange body[2]. In the year 1796, the new institution spread into the counties adjacent to, and surrounding Armagh, and the number of its sworn members became considerable. With increasing strength, a higher ambition developed itself, and Orangeism, which had at first sought nothing further than to be suffered to exist, boldly offered its services to the Irish Government. In consequence of this gallant offer, the yeomanry corps of Ireland was formed, while, at the same time, Orangemen, as Orangemen, were permitted to act in connexion with the royal forces, and against the insurgents. We find, in the general orders of the time, evidence in proof of this truth; we find further, that thirty thousand Orangemen, as such, were reviewed by General Lord Lake and General Knox, at Lurgan; and we have on record from the latter gallant officer—one whose tolerant and liberal principles and character have never been impugned—a testimonial in praise of his Orange volunteers, which, coming from one under whom they had served in the most trying times, must be regarded as of the very highest importance[3].

[2] At a later period this was done dishonestly, and it became necessary by the Orange test to exclude all who had been engaged in any treasonable conspiracy.

[3] We offer no apology for presenting the reader with a copy of this important document:—

"*Dungannon, June* 27, 1799.

"Sir,—I have had the honour to receive the address of the Grand Orange Lodge of the county Tyrone.

"Nothing can be more satisfactory to me than to know that my conduct while in command of this district met with the approbation of so loyal a body as the Orangemen of Tyrone.

"I can with the greatest sincerity declare, that should this country be again disturbed by foreign or domestic enemies, it would be my ambition to serve with the yeomanry and Orangemen of the North.

"This is not the sentiment of a day, called forth by the compliment conveyed in

They may boast, however, a testimonial of still more convincing authority—the state of Ulster previously to, and after, their organization. How the Orange institution found that province the reader has seen. He need not be told, that for a space of nearly half a century, indeed until within the last two years, when, during the suspension of Orangeism, and under the supine sway of the existing government, its peace has been invaded, the condition of Ulster has been, in order, tranquillity, and freedom from crime, in no respect inferior to that of England. It is not amiss to add, that the Orange system has had its alternations of war and peace establishments, according as the troubled or tranquil state of the country demanded exertion or admitted of repose. "When the danger ceased," said Lieut.-Col. Verner, "I conceived that the Orange societies ceased also; for instance, about the year 1814 the society had in a great measure died away[4]." Outrage in that year, as well as alarming indications of worse evils to come, caused the society to revive. It was so in the year 1821, also in 1826, in 1830; and now again we see that the disorganization into which society in Ireland seems breaking up has called it into renewed action.

It will not surprise the reader to learn that Orange Societies should have been what, in his well-known speech of 1814, Sir Robert Peel said of them, "from the loyal principles which they professed, and their firm and determined hostility to the factious and disloyal," "peculiarly obnoxious, and objects of marked hostility" "to that class of persons." This hostility began early to show itself. The following extract we have taken from the report of the Secret Committee, 1798:—

"As an instance of the arts used to make the Orange Association an occasion of exciting in the breasts of the lower class of Catholics the most malignant and vindictive passions, the following series of fabricated rules and regulations, intended to be considered as those of the Orangemen, are here inserted. The copy from which they are transcribed was found in the house of Maclery, a tailor; but similar copies were frequently found, both on the persons, and in the houses, of United Irishmen.

"'1st. Resolved unanimously, that each and every member be furnished with a case of horse pistols and a sword; also, that every member shall have twelve rounds of ball cartridges.

"'2nd. Resolved, that every man shall be ready at a moment's warning.

"'3rd. Resolved, that no member is to introduce a Papist or Presbyterian, Quaker or Methodist, or any persuasion but a Protestant.

your address, but one that I have long entertained, and have been forward to acknowledge." &c. &c. &c.

[4] Lords' Committee, 1825.

"'4th. Resolved, that no man wear Irish manufacture, nor give employment to any Papist.

"'5th. Resolved, that every man shall be ready at a moment's warning to burn all the chapels and meeting-houses in the city and county of Dublin.

"'6th. Resolved, that any man that will give information of any house he suspects to be a United Irishman's, will receive the sum of £5, and his name kept private.'"

The *tactique* of misrepresentation thus early adopted against the Orange societies has been up to this hour persevered in, and has often been most virulent and unscrupulous at the time when the efforts of the factious and disloyal were most to be dreaded.

The following passages from a speech delivered by Mr. O'Connell, and from evidence given in by him before a parliamentary committee, will show how the tactique of invective was still pursued against the Orange body, and will show also the stuff the current inventions were made of.

"I had from a militia officer, a friend of mine, the detail of the initiation of an Orangeman. The gentleman I allude to was allowed by mistake to be present in an Orange Lodge, in the county of Wexford, when two Orangemen were *made*. The ceremony contained an analogy to the facts related in the seventh and eighth chapters of Judges; and the pass-word was, 'the Sword of the Lord and of Gideon!' The Orangemen were the 300 selected by Divine inspiration from the immense multitude; the 32,000 who originally formed the camp of the Israelites; and as these 300 were composed, by the directions of the Most High, of the men who lapped water out of their hands, without kneeling to drink at the running stream, this chosen few of the Orangemen were designated as 'the men who lap and do not kneel!' And distinct allusions were made to a different liquor for Orangemen than water; a liquor to be furnished by the kneeling and superstitious Papists. The oaths were administered with much solemnity, and the secret signs communicated; and the newly initiated were reminded that, with so small a number, Gideon had brought confusion and destruction on the numerous host of the Midianites! The Orangemen became thus the chosen of the Lord, and the Papists were the Midianites doomed to destruction!"

This was spoken by Mr. O'Connell the year in which Dr. Drumgoole made his memorable and menacing speech, and in which the Ribbon Societies began openly to show themselves. In the year 1825, the learned Agitator was examined before a parliamentary committee as to the source whence he derived some very false information of a similar character.

"Was your informant an Orangeman? Yes, my informant was a person who was stated to me to be an Orangeman.

"Your informant was stated to you to be an Orangeman? To have been an Orangeman.

"Your informant did not give that account of himself, did he? I got in writing from the informant upon that particular subject the information; I refused to see him, because, circumstanced as I am in Ireland, I do not like to hold personal intercourse.

"Do you believe he is an Orangeman? I do.

"What was his name? I should certainly wish not to mention that; I pledged my sacred word of honour, that I would not mention the name of a person who came to me on this subject; a most solemn pledge as a gentleman that I would not give his name. I gave money to my informer; I was also to give more money, after giving as solemn a pledge as a gentleman could that I would not mention the name; but at the time I made the pledge, that he should come forward by summons in a court of justice, for I would not give any pledge that should exclude evidence from a court of justice . . . . . .

"In making this information public respecting the Orangemen, which certainly reflects very much upon their character, do you not think it would have been as well if you had published the terms on which the information had been procured, as far as regards the Orange Association? Certainly, if it had lain in my way, I would; I would not do any thing derogatory to any human being, without giving him perfectly fair notice at the time; I originally published that in the Catholic Association which has been mentioned; I also distinctly mentioned that I had given money for the information, and that I was to give more [5]."

A few days after he had given this evidence, Mr. O'Connell was re-examined. We subjoin a passage from the report of his testimony, delivered March 4.

"*I give up my informer entirely;* and may I be allowed to say, that the gentleman to whom I gave my honour not to mention his name, though he knew me well, as I understood, was a student of Trinity College; but I could not tell his name precisely,—I only conjecture his name; I consider him, therefore, and the person who informed me for money, as certainly persons on whom no faith can be distinctly relied; *that I think right to say now* [6]."

Better, in our judgment, had he said so before; but even so late, it is of some value to have it shown that the charges against the Orange Society were baseless and untenable.

Our space draws to a close; but we must advert briefly to the present state of the land. We see by the public prints that the Orangemen are again reviving and reconstructing their association; and whatever we may think of the expediency of such

[5] Commons' Committee, March 1, 1825.
[6] Ibid. March 4, 1825.

a movement at such a time, we must confess that it is in harmony with what has been uniformly alleged on the part of that loyal body. If the emergency of 1814, when Ribbon societies showed themselves, and Romish intolerance was more than ordinarily menacing, and Sir Robert Peel informed the House of Commons that convictions had been had before the judge of assize in Ireland for the crime of swearing allegiance to Buonaparte (then, we believe, in Elba); or the perils of 1821, when Lord Plunkett had the painful duty of prosecuting a traitorous body, whose purposes had become known, for a conspiracy to massacre or exterminate Protestants; or the dangers of 1831-32, when the new Irish volunteers arose, and the Protestant clergy were so cruelly persecuted, and the mission of the lighted turf seemed designed to mark out Protestant victims, and to telegraph signals to their adversaries;—excused the drawing closer the bonds of union between those who were set in imminent and manifest danger; the existing state of Ireland, we contend, will afford an equal justification, at least, for the projected reorganization of Orange Societies.

Do we advise this measure? No; but we affirm that the emergency which suggests it to loyal men, warns England that her laws and her mild administration of them require alteration to render them meet for Ireland. We counsel such alteration, and confidently affirm, that if Irish Protestants can find protection for life, liberty, and property, within the law, they will not seek for protection in any form of society which shall not be conceived in the spirit of our constitution.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

---

1. Wright's Essays. 2. Hussey's Bede. 3. Wright's Biographia Literaria. 4. D'Aubigné's Reformation. 5. Coniston Hall, by Gresley. 6. Trollope's Justin Martyr. 7. Moberly's Sermons. 8. Trench on Miracles. 9. Landon's Manual of Councils. 10. Modern Hagiology. 11. Old Testament History. 12. Cary's Lives of English Poets—Early French Poets. 13. Bohn's Library. 14. Alford's Poems. 15. Sermons by Vaughan, Heurtley, Bowdler, Addison, Gregg. 16. Light in the Dwelling. 17. Voices from the Early Church. 18. James on the Ordination Service. 19. Sacred Poems for Mourners. 20. Verses for Holy Seasons. 21. The Druidess. 22. Sermons by Dr. Hook. 23. Stephen's Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Statutes. 24. Hart's Ecclesiastical Records. 25. Babington on Slavery. 26. Burns' Fireside Library. 27. Non-conformist Sonnets. 28. Pamphlets, &c.

1.—*Essays on Subjects connected with the Literature, Popular Superstitions, and History of England in the Middle Ages. By* Thomas Wright, *M.A. F.S.A. In* 2 *vols.* London: J. R. Smith.

These volumes, interesting as they will doubtless be to the antiquarian, are not less deserving of the attention of the student of history, and even of the reader who is in search of amusement rather than of instruction. They relate, as a whole, to the literature, history, manners, and customs of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and the information which they convey is of a description which at once attests its own fidelity; being, in fact, chiefly comprised in translations from the works of contemporary authors, accompanied by the originals, in many cases. The copious citations which illustrate the pages of this work, and the careful analyses with which it abounds, contribute largely to its interest as well as its value. The first chapter includes a clear and brief account of the progress of the study of Anglo Saxon Literature, from the time of Queen Elizabeth to the recent labours of Rask and Grimm, and of Thorpe, Kemble, Bosworth, and other English writers. This is followed by an analysis of

the poem of Beowulf—the only complete monument of the compositions of the Saxon bards while their countrymen still retained their paganism. Mr. Kemble, who has published an edition of this curious relic, fixes the date of the hero of this poem, in the fifth century; and Mr. Wright observes, that there are many reasons for believing that it was brought here by our first Anglo Saxon settlers. The poem itself consists of a description of the exploits of a chieftain of the Angles of Sleswick and Jutland, in his contest with an unearthly monster, "the Grendel," who regularly made his supper, each night, on some of the guards of the king of Denmark.

An essay on Anglo Norman poetry and romance, introduces us to the minstrels, jongleurs, and troubadours, and their writings. The specimens which are given convey the notion of a strange mixture of generosity and devotion, with gross immorality and obscenity.

The "*Chansons de geste*," or historical romances of the middle ages, form the subject of an amusing chapter: proverbs, popular sayings, and nursery rhymes are also considered at length; after which, we have disquisitions on the Anglo Latin poetry of the twelfth century; the scholastic philosophy as taught by Abelard, and the German mythology as illustrated by the researches of Grimm.

"The National Fairy Mythology of England" supplies to the author a rich fund of singular and wild adventure. Much of the fanciful and supernatural in the ecclesiastical mythology of these ages is attributed, and apparently with some reason, to a wish on the part of the monks to Christianize the floating traditions which had been derived from heathenism; and the result was, that saints and devils were clothed with the legendary attributes, which in former ages had gathered themselves round the fairies and elves.

"St. Guthlac built him a mud-cot in the isle of Croyland, a wild spot, then covered with woods, and pools, and sedgy marshes. The isle had hitherto been uninhabited by men; but many a goblin played among its solitudes, and very unwilling were they to be driven out. They came upon him in a body, dragged him from his cell, sometimes tossed him in the air, at others dipped him over head in the bogs, and then tore him through the midst of the brambles; but their efforts were vain against one who was armed like Guthlac, for he carried to the combat 'scutum fidei, loricam spei, galeam castitatis, arcum pœnitentiæ, sagittas psalmodiæ.'"—i. 263.

There is an essay on a very curious subject; "The Popular

Superstitions of Modern Greece," which is illustrated from the writings of Leo Allatius, Michael Psellus, &c. The στοιχεῖα or river spirits, the ναραγίδαι or spirits of the waters and of the mountains, the witches, changlings, vampires, and other objects of Greek superstition, are described in a very amusing way. Leo Allatius relates a story of his recovery from illness at seven years of age, which is wonderful enough :—

"Three days I had not been able to speak, and had not tasted food, and I lay in a state of insensibility. My mother went to the church of the Virgin of Loretto, who at Chios is held in great veneration, and returned with a sprig of myrtle, with which she had touched the image. Plucking a leaf, she rubbed it over every part of my face and breast, and, strange to relate, I immediately recovered my senses, opened my eyes, and I saw and knew my mother."

After this, the branch of myrtle was put in a cupboard where are paintings of the saints, and in the evening the lamps were lighted on the images, so that the myrtle could be seen. In the night, Allatius saw two beautiful women come, and each take a leaf from the myrtle, and afterwards others came, two at a time, and imitated their example :—

"Presently came one woman much taller, more elegantly dressed, and more beautiful than the others, as if she were the mistress of them all; and, not content with a leaf, she took the whole branch. In an agony of grief I shouted out aloud, 'Madame! Madame!' for so children in our country call their mothers."

The mother assures her son that the myrtle is safe and sound in the cupboard, and, to reassure him, touches his head and breast with it, on which he demands something to eat, falls asleep, and next morning awakes in perfect health. Allatius of course attributes his cure to the Virgin.

We are next introduced to those mirthful beings Puck, Robin Goodfellow, Friar Rush, &c., and to some account of their mischievous dealing with monks and friars, whom they seem to have had a particular pleasure in intoxicating and setting together by the ears. The essay on "Popular Stories," which succeeds, traces a large portion of the *fabliaux* to Eastern originals—in fact, to the *Thousand and One Nights*. The well-known story of the Hunchback, for instance, appears in several forms in the romance literature. Several collections of stories directly translated from the Eastern languages, made their appearance in the twelfth century.

A very interesting tale forms the subject of one of these

essays. The Adventures of Hereward the Saxon. This tale, which is chiefly a translation from a Latin manuscript of the twelfth century, was originally published in Ainsworth's Magazine. It records the bold achievements of an Anglo Saxon noble, in resistance to the Norman invaders of England, and to William the Conqueror, which eventually win the favour and admiration of the Norman.

The story of "Eustace the Monk" affords another series of adventures which, if they do not equal those of Hereward in historical interest, exceed them in grotesque variety. Eustace, who had studied the occult sciences at Toledo, afterwards becomes a monk, and on his father's death is unjustly deprived by the Count of Boulogne of the lands which ought to have been his by right of inheritance. The uncle on this becomes a sort of Robin Hood, and takes his revenge in a series of pranks, which throw those of that celebrated outlaw quite into the shade. We must give a specimen or two.

"Many a trick did Eustace play upon his enemies. One day, as the count, with nine attendants, was riding to Hendelot, Eustace, with ten companions, followed him in the garb of pilgrims. When the count descended from his horse, Eustace came to him and said, 'Sire, we are penitents from the apostle of Rome: many injuries we have done to man, of which, by God's grace, we have repented. We are now in great need.' The count gave him three pence, and entered the castle with his followers, leaving the ten horses without. Eustace took them all, set fire to the town, and fled, leaving a serjeant to tell the count that this had been all done by the penitent on whom he had bestowed his three pence. 'By my faith,' said the count, 'I was a fool not to seize those rascals! those vagabonds! those false pilgrims! If I desired to leave the castle I have not a horse to mount. This monk is truly a devil. If I had him, he should rue it, I warrant me.' Eustace met with a merchant, and sent him with one of the horses to the count, telling him that it was the tithe of his gains."—ii. 133.

On another occasion, Eustace, being pursued by the count, had recourse to the following stratagem:—

"He equipped himself as a leper, with cap, crutch, and clapper; and when the count passed he began to rattle his clapper, by which he gained in charity from the count and his knights twenty-eight pence. At a short distance in the rear, a boy was leading one of the count's finest horses. Eustace knocked him down, mounted the saddle, and galloped away, leaving the lad to tell it to the count, who, almost mad with rage, turned again to pursue him."

These adventures frequently issue in the capture of the count's

horses by this successful depredator. Another illustration of the manners and habits of these times is supplied by the interesting adventures of Fulk Fitzwarrine, a baron who had been deprived of his lands by King John, and who, in consequence, adopts a system of reprisals, which at length have the effect of compelling the king to do him justice, and restore his possessions. Strange and evidently fabulous as are many of the incidents recorded in these biographies, they throw light on the feelings and habits of the age, and the general outline is strictly historical.

There is a curious disquisition on the tales and traditions of Robin Hood, whom, we are sorry to see, our author regards as an imaginary character; and also on the conquest of Ireland in the reign of King Henry II. On the whole, we are bound to say that these volumes present an interesting outline of the manners and ideas of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

II.—*Bædæ Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum, &c. Curâ* Roberti Hussey, *B.D., Hist. Eccl. Prof. Reg.* Oxonii: e Typographeo Academico.

This portable and convenient edition of Venerable Bede's Ecclesiastical History is printed from the text of Smith, with corrections and various readings selected from versions, manuscripts, and other editions of the work. From what we have observed, the learned editor appears to have performed his part most satisfactorily, and we have no doubt that, from the mass of information which he has brought to bear on the subject, considerable light will be thrown on many passages in this most precious monument. We observe that the Irish Annals, published by Dr. O'Conor, have been extensively employed for the purpose of illustration, and that even such recent works as Mr. Petrie's Essay on Round Towers have supplied materials. The erudition displayed in the annotations is altogether very striking, and the gratification of the reader is increased by the very modest manner in which the Editor alludes in the preface to his own labours. We can have no hesitation in recommending this edition of Bede to all students of Ecclesiastical history.

III.—*Biographia Britannica Literaria; or, Biography of Literary Characters of Great Britain and Ireland, arranged in Chronological Order. By* Thomas Wright, *M.A.* London: Parker.

The volume before us is the second of a series which is being published under the superintendence of the Royal Society of

Literature. It includes brief memoirs of the writers who flourished from the conquest to the end of the reign of King John, with catalogues of their works. To the historian, and generally to all who are engaged in researches into the condition of society in those ages, this volume cannot fail to be of great value.

IV.—*History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Vol. IV. By* J. H. Merle D'Aubigne, *D.D., &c.* Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

The popularity which the former volumes of this history have acquired in England and America, has induced the author to publish the continuation of it in England and in the English language, instead of in France. The circulation of the volumes already published amounts, as the author informs us, to 150,000 or 200,000 in the English language, while in France the number hardly exceeds 4,000. What proportion of the larger number has been sold in England we are not informed; we apprehend that the American sale must account for the immense difference between the circulation of the original and the translation. We have known of instances in which works which have attracted interest in this country, and of which a few thousand copies have been sold here, have been reprinted in America, and sold to the extent of 100,000 copies and upwards. Of course such reprints can be sold at a much cheaper rate than the original works printed in this country; but still the extreme avidity for such publications is a very interesting phenomenon, and evinces tendencies in the American mind, which bid fair to create an independent literature at no distant period.

The present volume of M. D'Aubigné's history commences with a narrative of the events in Germany, which took place from 1526 to 1530, including the history of the Diet of Spiers, and of the Diet of Augsburg. It also details the progress of the Swiss Reformation from 1526 till the death of Zuinglius. To those who are acquainted with the literary merits and the principles of M. D'Aubigné, it must be wholly superfluous to offer any observations on the peculiar characteristics of the work before us. For ourselves, we must profess, that while sensible of the beauty of the composition, and the great research evidently employed in every part, and while sympathizing with the affectionate feeling with which the author regards the cause of the Reformation in general, we cannot enter into his views in many places on questions of Church government. We must say, however, that bear-

ing in mind the actual position of the author, and of the community of which he is a member, and the associations into which that position have brought him, there is quite as much of moderation and impartiality in his pages, as it would have been reasonable to expect. Of course, in speaking of impartiality, we do not allude to the questions in debate between Rome and the Reformation, in which M. D'Aubigné is decidedly and openly opposed on principle to the former.

From the preface to the present volume we learn that the English Reformation is to occupy the historian's attention in the next.

"It is not, however, without some portion of fear that I approach the History of the Reformation in England; it is perhaps more difficult than elsewhere. I have received communications from some of the most respectable men of the different ecclesiastical parties, who, each feeling convinced that their own point of view is the true one, desire me to present the history in this light. I hope to execute my task with impartiality and truth. But I thought it would be advantageous to study for some time longer the principles and the facts. I am at present occupied in this task, and shall consecrate to it, with God's assistance, the first part of my next volume."

We shall look with considerable interest for the appearance of the next volume of this history.

v.—*Coniston Hall; or the Jacobites. A Historical Tale. By the Rev.* W. Gresley, *M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield.* London: Burns.

The interesting tale before us is in illustration of one of the principal epochs of modern English history,—the revolution of 1688; or rather of the consequences and results of that measure. The narrative itself relates to the ill-fated insurrection in 1715, under the Earl of Mar, in Scotland, and under the Earl of Derwentwater and Mr. Forster in England. The earlier part of the story brings us acquainted with two branches of an ancient Cumbrian family, one of which is of the Jacobite, and the other of the Whig or Hanoverian party. A visit from Colonel Dalton and his family to their relatives, Sir Charles Dalton and his son Edward, leads to the incidents on which the tale chiefly turns; while in the intercourse which takes place between these relations, all the leading opinions, principles, and arguments of both parties are brought out. Edward, who, as in duty bound, falls in love with his cousin Clara, is deeply involved in the conspiracy

with Lord Derwentwater, and is actually arrested on a charge of treason, but makes his escape, and joins the insurrectionary movement. We shall not proceed further with the story, of which enough has been said to convey some idea of its general character, but proceed to select a few passages as illustrative of the way in which the subject has been treated.

Edward and Clara, in one of their excursions in the neighbourhood of Coniston Hall, are obliged to take shelter at the mansion of the Earl of Derwentwater. They find the countess in the deepest distress, her lord having been that morning compelled to fly on the approach of a king's messenger with a party of soldiers, who had come to arrest the earl on a charge of high treason. The family had retired to rest, when Edward found himself suddenly surrounded by a body of armed men, and arrested on the same charge. He was allowed to retire to his bedroom under guard.

"The officer went with him to see that all was safe. He searched carefully to discover if there was no secret door through which he might escape; threw up the window, and seeing that it looked down into the deep water of the lake, observed jocosely, 'You may jump out there if you like, young sir.' So saying, he left the room, bolting and barring the room after him, and leaving Edward again to the train of his meditations.

"These were now diverted into a different channel. His career seemed at once checked. The crisis of his fate seemed suspended. The struggle is about to take place, and he no longer allowed to take part in it. Now that he was likely to be kept a close prisoner, shut up probably in Lancaster Castle, his spirit chafed against the restraint, and he determined, if possible, to escape. The door was firmly fastened, so that there was no hope of making his escape in that direction. Chimney there was none. The window was his only chance. But to throw himself thence into the lake seemed certain death. . . As Edward watched the scene with mingled feelings, he fancied that he heard the splash of an oar in the water, and soon after another, as of a person cautiously rowing on the lake. Presently a boat was seen cautiously creeping round the headland at some fifty yards' distance, in which Edward could distinguish a single figure. Slowly and silently it approached until it arrived underneath his window. The rower paused for a moment, and then said in a suppressed voice, 'Mr. Dalton, are you there?' 'Yes,' said Edward; 'is it Robin?' 'It is: all is right, then. Are you ready to escape from the window?' 'If you can tell me how to get down without breaking my neck.' 'I have a rope; you must let something down to draw it up.' Edward immediately thought of his fishing-tackle, which he had brought with him, little thinking of the use it would be; and speedily unrolling a line, he

let it down from the window. Robin attached the hook to the rope that he had brought with him, and Edward drew it up in safety. It was a good stout rope, knotted at regular intervals in order to prevent the hands from slipping. It was soon fastened to the iron stanchion of the window, and Edward ascended the window-sill. He was active and muscular, not unused to feats of the sort; so that he had little difficulty in letting himself down to the rock on which the castle was built, and thence to the boat.

"'Thank God, we are safe so far!' said Robin. 'Now we must make as little noise as possible. I must first go to the landing.' 'Would it not be better to go straight to the opposite shore?' 'No; we had better take the other boats along with us, to prevent pursuit.' Robin quickly attached the other boats to the stern of that in which he was sitting; and the castle being separated from the shore by scarcely a stone's throw, it did not take long to place Edward in safety on the other side."—pp. 139, 140.

The following passage contains the author's views of the non-jurors:—

"The body of non-jurors, though weakened by this and other causes, continued to exist for more than a century. They might have been called the *un*established Church of England; and however we may judge of their 'position,' whether before or after the death of the first non-juring bishops, their case presents a valuable example of the inherent independence of the Church on the State; a reversion, so to speak, to the state of things which existed before the days of Constantine, when the Christian Church existed in its purity, without the aid of kings or governments. They were, in fact, forced back on the primitive model, and many of them imbibed a truly primitive spirit. Those who least admire their principles cannot refuse them the praise of piety and learning. One result was, that being debarred from all prospect of rising in their profession, and from exerting themselves in ordinary duties, many of them devoted their time to literary pursuits; and many excellent volumes of divinity were the result of their labours. They depended for their maintenance on the contributions of their small flocks, and some of them were reduced to great poverty. Bishop Wagstaffe was obliged to practise as a physician in order to obtain a living; Bishop Blackburne supported himself by correcting the press in a printer's office; to so low a degree in worldly circumstances were they reduced."—p. 109.

VI.—*S. Justini Philosophi et Martyris Apologia Prima. Edited by the Rev.* W. Trollope, *M.A., Pembroke College, Cambridge.* Cambridge: Macmillan, Barclay, and Macmillan.

Several editions of works of the Fathers have recently made their appearance at Cambridge, which evince the growing interest

in such studies, while they reflect considerable credit on the writers who have so carefully edited them. Amongst them we must assign the first place to the important and admirably executed edition of Chrysostom on St. Matthew, by Mr. Field; the valuable collection of tracts, published by Mr. Harvey, in illustration of the thirty-nine Articles; and Mr. Woodham's edition of Tertullian's Apologeticus, with critical and explanatory notes, which evince the most perfect scholarship, and a thorough knowledge of his subject. Mr. Woodham's work, which is further enriched by a preface containing much valuable matter on the early Christian apologists generally, seems to have formed the model to a certain degree, which has been followed in the well-executed edition of Justin Martyr's Apology now before us. We wish that the learned Editor would confer an additional favour on the student by continuing his labours on this ancient writer, and presenting to the world a complete edition of his works. For the portion, however, which has now been so carefully and judiciously executed, we are bound to offer our thanks to Mr. Trollope.

VII.—*The Sayings of the Great Forty Days, &c., with an Examination of Mr. Newman's Doctrine of Development. By* GEORGE MOBERLY, *D.C.L., Head Master of Winchester College. Second Edition.* London: Rivingtons.

WE have great pleasure in seeing a second edition of Dr. Moberly's excellent volume, enriched by an elaborate preface, comprising an examination of Mr. Newman's theory of Development. The firm and decided tone in which Dr. Moberly speaks on this important subject is very gratifying. The following passages are well worthy of attention:—

"It is as inconceivable that other minds have been swayed to take the same step on the same argumentative ground, as it is that the authorities of the Romish Church should sanction and approve those argumentative grounds. The book is an idiosyncrasy. It contains Mr. Newman's intellectual confessions; but those confessions cannot conceivably depict the state of other minds, or at least not of many besides his own. . . . Earnestly convinced, a few years since, that the English Church held a true, independent, Catholic position, he has been distressed and shaken by the 'fertility of thought,' the many theories, the 'more hopeful position of infidelity' in these days. He has sighed for an infallible guide; he has felt the absolute need of a living governor, from whose lips he might receive the full detailed rule of faith and practice without doubt or question. He has been disposed to hope

that the absolute necessity which he felt of such spiritual supremacy formed a good argument to prove that it was actually given. And then a passage or phrase of M. Guizot has fallen as a spark upon this prepared state of mind and feeling, and produced this melancholy explosion. No matter if the very thing itself is unknown to the Romish controversialists. The theory itself may be applied to heal its own defects. Implicit tenets may well have been defended by implicit arguments.

"But where shall there be found another mind which has known all this experience and traversed all this course; a mind which, having been originally attached to the low or evangelical view of doctrine, was afterwards so lucidly and learnedly convinced of the soundness of the Anglican theory, [we cannot acquiesce in the correctness of this statement;] a mind so distressed and agitated in its intellectual depths by the aggression of infidel dangers; a mind so yearning for a position of spiritual slavery, as the only intellectual dry land out of the flood of unbelief; a mind so stored with learning, able to press to its purpose so vast a variety of illustrative matter, and to urge an argument with so lucid and forcible a logic; a mind capable of reading history all of a sudden with new eyes, and representing facts and statements distantly relevant to its point, in the very light which it has itself recognized and described as uncandid and untrue before?"—p. lv. lvi.

The preface, as far as it goes, will be found of considerable value, as an antidote to the theory of development; but the limited space allotted to the discussion, of course prevents it from assuming the character of a formal refutation of the argument of Mr. Newman's book.

VIII.—*Notes on the Miracles of our Lord. By* RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, *M.A. Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants, Professor of Divinity, King's College, London, &c.* London: Parker.

MR. Trench has brought to the illustration of his subject powers and attainments which are seldom found in combination; an accurate criticism, a varied reading, a subtle and philosophical ingenuity, under the guidance of a reverential spirit, which render this volume one of the most interesting and valuable which has recently come under our notice. One of the especial objects of this work evidently is, to furnish a reply to the objections which rationalism and infidelity have raised on the subject of the miracles, and to expose the folly and absurdity of those who have, in various instances, endeavoured to explain them away, or to resolve them into the operation of natural causes. And this seems to us, as far as we have had an opportunity of observing,

to have been very successfully done. The moral instruction derivable from the miracles and their attendant circumstances, is very thoughtfully and beautifully brought out. As an instance of Mr. Trench's mode of treating his subject, we would refer to his notes on the demoniacs in the country of the Gadarenes. He begins by offering some prefatory remarks on the subject of the demoniacs of Scripture.

"It is of course," says Mr. Trench, "easy enough to cut short the whole enquiry, and to leave no question at all, by saying these demoniacs were insane persons,—epileptic, maniac, melancholic, and there is essential truth in the view that these possessions are bodily maladies. There was, no doubt, a substratum of disease, which may have helped to lay open to the deeper evil, and upon which it was superinduced: and, in agreement with this view, we may observe that cases of possession are at once classed with those of various sicknesses, and at the same time distinguished from them, by the Evangelists; who thus at once mark the relation and the difference (Matt. iv. 24; viii. 16; Mark i. 33). But the scheme which confounds these cases with those of disease, does not, as I think every reverent handler of God's word must own, exhaust the matter; it cannot be taken as a satisfactory solution; and this for more reasons than one.

"And first, our Lord himself uses language which is not reconcilable with such a theory; He every where speaks of demoniacs, not as persons merely of disordered intellects but as subjects, and thralls of spiritual might; He addresses the evil spirit as a person different from the man; 'Hold thy peace and come out of him,' (Mark i. 25.) And the poor reply, that He fell into and humoured the notions of the afflicted, in order to facilitate their cure, is cut off by the fact, that in his next confidential discourse with his disciples, He uses exactly the same language (Matt. x. 8; and especially xvii. 21, 'This kind goeth not forth but by prayer and fasting.')"

Then follow some judicious remarks on the impossibility of our Saviour's having thus deceived his disciples; after which the writer proceeds thus:—

"And then besides this, the phenomena themselves are such as no theory of the kind avails to explain, and they then bid us to seek for some more satisfying solution. For that madness was not the constituent element in the demoniac state is clear, since not only we have not the slightest ground for supposing that the Jews would have considered all maniacs, epileptic, or melancholic persons, to be under the power of evil spirits; but we have distinct evidence that the same disease they did sometimes attribute to an evil spirit, and sometimes not . . . Thus on two occasions they bring to the Lord those that were dumb; (Matt. ix. 32; xii. 22; on the second occasion it is one dumb and blind;) and in each of these cases, the dumbness is traced to an evil spirit: yet it is plain that they did not consider all

dumbness as having the same root; for in the history given by Mark (vii. 32.) of one deaf and dumb that was the subject of Christ's healing power, it is the evident intention of the Evangelist to describe one labouring only under natural defects."

After this the writer discusses the question of what demoniacal possession really was. He rejects the notion of Heiroth, who traces up insanity, in every case, to foregoing sin, and he equally rejects the idea that the demoniacs are necessarily the worst of men, and that their possession was a plague for sin which had surpassed that of their fellows; nevertheless, he connects it with the commission of sin, and makes its peculiarity to consist in a sense of misery.

"This sense of misery, this yearning after deliverance, seems in fact what made these demoniacs objects and subjects for Christ's healing power. Without it, they would have been as little objects of this as the devils, who are complete and circular in evil, in whom there is nothing for the Divine power to take hold of; so that even in their case, as in every other, faith was the condition of healing. There was a spark of higher life not yet trodden out in them, which, indeed, as long as they were alone, was but light enough to reveal to them all their darkness; yet was it that which Christ took hold of, to fan again into a flame."

This may, perhaps, afford some slight idea of the way in which Mr. Trench has treated his subject. We regret that space does not permit us to enter at length on the discussion of the interesting topic which has just been considered, but the remainder of his essay is well worthy of an attentive perusal. We should add, that a very interesting and thoughtful essay on the miracles in general is prefixed to the work.

IX.—*A Manual of Councils of the Holy Catholic Church, comprising the substance of the most remarkable and important Canons, alphabetically arranged. By the Rev.* E. H. Landon, *M.A.* London: Rivingtons.

This summary of the Councils seems to be very well executed, as far as we can judge; and as it seems that there is no other manual in the English language which comprises an account of all the Councils, both general and provincial, the work before us will probably be very acceptable to students. It is arranged in alphabetical order, and references are in all cases appended to the collections of Labbe, Wilkins, or other authentic sources of information.

x.—*Modern Hagiology; an Examination of the Nature and Tendency of some Legendary and Devotional Works, &c. By the Rev.* J. C. Crosthwaite, *M.A.* London: Parker.

Concurring, as we do, in the truth of much which Mr. Crosthwaite has urged in this work against the series of Lives of English Saints originally devised by Mr. Newman, and at first authorized by him, and against various publications of Mr. Oakley, Mr. Ward, and Dr. Pusey, we were by no means convinced of the expediency of thus directing attention to theories which were so evidently mistaken, and so inconsistent with common sense, that their speedy downfal might have been anticipated; nor did it seem that Mr. Crosthwaite had treated the subject in such a spirit as was likely to be productive of good. On these accounts we cannot say that we regard with any satisfaction the republication of this series of papers in their present form. We do not think that the cause of truth can be promoted by bitterness and acrimony of tone, or by personalities.

xi.—*The Old Testament History. Drawn up in Simple Language for the Use of the Young and Unlearned. By* a Country Clergyman. London: Rivingtons.

This abridgment of the history of the Old Testament extends to the death of Joshua; and its peculiarity seems to consist in its interweaving of moral instruction in the thread of the narrative. There is of course some risk in constructing a history which substitutes for the simple language of Scripture something still simpler and more adapted to the use of children; and we do not hesitate to say that such a task is amongst the most difficult which can be proposed; but the little volume before us proves that it can be accomplished. In a work of the kind the great point is, that it should be free from error, or from what is too much in the nature of a human commentary on the Word of God; and as far as we have observed, such a condition is fulfilled in this abridgment. An appendix comprises copious sets of questions on each chapter of the work. The illustrations are numerous, and in many instances very well conceived and executed.

xii.—1. *Lives of English Poets, from Johnson to Kirke White, designed as a continuation of Johnson's Lives. By the late Rev.* Henry Francis Cary, *M.A.*, Translator of Dante. London: Bohn.

2. *The Early French Poets, a Series of Notices and Translations.*

By the late Rev. Henry Francis Cary, *M.A.* London: Bohn.

These volumes comprise two series of papers contributed by the well-known translator of Dante to the London Magazine at various times from 1821 to 1825, "at which time," as the later of these works informs us, "that periodical could reckon among its contributors names of no less note than those of Charles Lamb, Hazlitt, De Quincy, Allan Cunningham, Thomas Hood, Thomas Carlyle, and the author's highly valued friend George Darley." The first of these publications is a series of lives of our English poets, from Johnson to Kirke White, with criticisms of their works. The reader will, of course, be familiar with the incidents of the memoirs of some of these writers, and others are perhaps of no great interest in themselves. But this may be said to a certain extent even of Johnson's Lives. The subject of the second publication is less familiar to the English reader; and it therefore takes the more interesting shape of translations from the works referred to, which are executed with the fidelity, spirit, and poetical taste which might have been anticipated. We select this little piece by Charles, Duke of Orleans, who lived in the fifteenth century:—

"The Time hath laid his mantle by,
Of wind, and rain, and icy chill;
And closes a rich embroidery
Of sun-light poured on lake and hill.

"No beast or bird in eastern sky,
Whose voice doth not in gladness thrill;
For Time hath laid his mantle by,
Of wind, and rain, and icy chill.

"River and fountain, brook and rill,
Bespangled o'er with livery gay
Of silver droplets, wind their way;
So all their new apparel vie;
The Time hath laid his mantle by."

XIII.—*Bohn's Standard Library.*

We have seen several volumes of Mr. Bohn's "Library," which are very neatly executed, and are published at so moderate a price as to be within the reach of all purchasers. The first of these volumes is Robert Hall's Miscellaneous Works and Remains, with a memoir of his life by Dr. Olinthus Gregory, and a critical estimate of his character and writings by John Foster,

author of "Essays on Decision of Character." The memoir is amusing enough, and the criticisms on Mr. Hall's style of preaching show much discrimination. It is curious enough, however, to find Robert Hall, amidst all the popularity which his writings acquired amongst Churchmen, holding the principles of a decided radical and democrat, and denouncing the very notion of an Established Church. "The Life of Leo the Tenth," by Roscoe, in two volumes, forms another portion of this series. This elegant work has been so long and so favourably known to the public, that it seems almost needless to recommend it to perusal; yet it may be as well to say to our younger readers, that they will here find the history of Europe generally, and of Italy in particular, at the period of the Reformation, including the state of literature and the fine arts, handled with a thorough knowledge of the various subjects which are brought under view.

"The Philosophy of History," by Frederick Von Schlegel, translated by J. B. Robertson, is another interesting volume in this series; it includes a well-written memoir of the author by the translator, who being a Romanist, writes *con amore* on the subject. Von Schlegel's conversion to Romanism has left pretty strong traces in the volume before us.

On the whole, if this series proceeds as it has begun, there seems to be a fair prospect of interest for readers of all classes and "denominations," and at a very cheap rate. We need not say that the works are selected without any reference to their religious or political views.

xiv.—*The Poetical Works of* Henry Alford. *In* 2 *Vols.* London: Burns.

Mr. Alford's poetry is pervaded throughout with an individuality and a unity of character, which forms one of its peculiar characteristics. All his poems bear the impress, or convey the expression of the same tender, affectionate, and thoughtful spirit. It is impossible to read them without becoming acquainted with the character of his mind and heart, and feeling ourselves drawn towards the writer by many bonds of sympathy. This it is which constitutes the charm of Mr. Alford's poetry. It is the outpouring of a heart with which our best feelings and affections are in unison; and this natural poetry finds vent and expression in song, which in its various modulations, conveys with perfect truth the idea of the spirit which has informed it.

These volumes comprise two poems of some length, "The Abbot of Muchelnaye," and "The School of the Heart," besides

a number of ballads, sonnets, and short poems. The first of these compositions is a very mournful tale of true love crossed; and we could only wish that its details had been more brought out. The second is a didactic poem, which, in a strain of pious and thoughtful feeling, aims at elevating the heart above the things of this world. Many of the sonnets in these volumes are pleasingly written. We must find space for one or two.

EASTER EVE.

"I saw two women weeping by the tomb
Of one new buried, in a fair green place,
Bower'd with shrubs; the eve retained no trace
Of aught that day performed, but the faint gloom
Of dying day was spread upon the sky;
The moon was broad and bright above the wood;
The breeze brought tokens of a multitude,
Music and shout, and mingled revelry.
At length came gleaming through the thickest shade
Helmet and casque, and steel-armed band,
Watched round the sepulchre in solemn stand;
The night word past, from man to man conveyed;
And I could see those women rise and go
Under the dark trees, moving sad and slow."

BRUGES.

"Wouldst thou behold, not the ensnaring blaze
Of earthly grandeur in its envious noon,
But the calm majesty of other days
Reposing, as beneath the summer moon
Rests the laid ocean—hie thee to the streets
Of ancient Bruges: temple, dome, and tower,
Or pathside dwelling—whatsoever meets
Thy roving sight, bears record of a power
Long since departed: surely not so fair
When pomp and pride are tenants here, as now,
When solitary forms with pious care,
Or thankful haply for some granted vow,
Stately and dark these vistas churchward tread,
Fit habitants for her whose form is with the dead."

XV.—1. *Sermons by* CHARLES JOHN VAUGHAN, *D.D., Head Master of Harrow School.* London: Murray.

2. *Justification. Eight Sermons preached before the University of Oxford, &c. By* CHARLES N. HEURTLEY, *B.D.* Oxford: Parker.

3. *Sermons on the Privileges, Responsibilities, and Duties of Members of the Gospel Covenant. Vol. II. By the Rev.* T. Bowdler, *M.A.* London: T. B. Sharpe.
4. *Expository Discourses on the Rod of Moses. By the Rev.* B. Addison, *M.A.* Edinburgh: Grants.
5. *Sermons on the Evangelical Doctrines of the Apostolic Church. By the Rev.* T. D. Gregg, *M.A.* Dublin: Curry.

Of these volumes of sermons, the first and third are plain and practical sets of discourses, intended for ordinary congregations, and without much ornament, setting forth the duties of Christians. The fourth connects the history of the children of Israel with the miracles wrought by means of the rod of Moses and, as far as we can see, it exhibits more than ordinary care and ability. The fifth volume is chiefly "evangelical" in its theological views, though we apprehend that there is much in it which is not very consistent with those views. Mr. Gregg is a supporter of the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, though he considers that the validity of the sacraments does not depend on this succession, and he holds that though "the Spirit of God may find his abode in individuals or in bodies who are outside the boundaries of the Apostolic Church" (which he connects with the episcopal succession) he is "compelled to believe that such cases are exceptions to the general rule; that such bodies are irregular; that they are only warranted temporarily; and that they will disappear immediately after the Church gathers from them the lesson which their existence is calculated to teach, and applies it to herself." These discourses are written with vigour and nerve. The second volume of sermons mentioned above, are the Bampton Lectures for last year. They appear to be solid and well-considered discourses, and sound in their theological views.

xvi.—*Light in the Dwelling; or a Harmony of the Four Gospels, with very short and simple Remarks, adapted to Reading at Family Prayers, &c.* London: Hatchards.

This work, which is a production of the author of "The Peep of Day," &c., and which professes to have been "revised and corrected by a Clergyman of the Church of England," is moderately "Evangelical" as regards its doctrine; and we doubt not, that from its pious and devotional tone, and from the simplicity of language which characterizes it throughout, it will obtain extensive circulation amongst those who approve of the general character of its theological views.

XVII.—*Voices from the Early Church. A Series of Poems.* London: Burns.

THE preface to this volume informs us that its contents "will be found to indicate a mind saddened by the present state of things in the Church of England, but not therefore inclined to join the Church of Rome. It appears to the Author, indeed, that English divines have been uncharitable in their language towards Rome, and that as Christians we ought to seek more earnestly than we do a reunion with her; but he is not disposed to conceal or explain away her corruptions." The poems are on such subjects as the following:—Praying towards the East—Flowers on the Altar—Lights on the Altar—The Fire of the Last Day—The White Robes of Baptism—The Sign of the Cross—Trine Immersion—Milk and Honey given to Infants at Baptism—Birthdays of Martyrs, &c. We cannot say that the poetry is such as to require any particular notice.

XVIII.—*A Practical Comment on the Ordination Services. By the Rev.* JOHN JAMES, *D.D., Canon of Peterborough.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS commentary on the offices for the ordinations of priests and deacons is intended by its author not only for the use of candidates for orders and the younger clergy, but also for the laity. We have been very favourably impressed by such parts of this work as we have perused, and it seems well calculated to promote an intelligent appreciation of the responsibilities of the ministerial office, and of the relations subsisting between the clergy and the laity.

XIX.—*Sacred Poems for Mourners. With an Introduction. By the Rev.* R. C. TRENCH, *M.A.* London: Rivingtons.

THE plan of this work is formed on the Burial Service; it is, in fact, a commentary on that office, consisting of a selection of short poetical pieces by various authors on its several parts. The selection of poetry seems to be good; and we doubt not that to some minds the perusal of this little volume will prove consolatory under circumstances of affliction.

XX.—*Verses for Holy Seasons; with Questions for Examination, by* C. F. H. *Edited by* WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, *D.D.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS little volume comprises a series of hymns for children,

adapted to all the Sundays and Holydays in the year. The auspices under which it is ushered into the world speak sufficiently for the pious and devotional character of the work; and as regards its general execution, some notion may be derived from the following stanzas from the hymn for the first Sunday in Advent:—

"When first our Lord came down on earth,
He did not scorn like us to be;
For He was born of mortal birth,
A simple child of low degree.

"Where Syrian waves are bright and clear,
Where Judah's grapes grow large and red,
He walked below; and men drew near,
And heard the holy words He said.

"But when the Lord shall come again,
With angel hosts encircled round,
All earth and heaven shall hail Him then,
With thunder-peal and trumpet-sound."

XXI.—*The Druidess; a Tale of the Fourth Century. Translated from the German.* London: T. B. Sharpe.

A PLEASING little tale, narrating the conversion of a Druidess to Christianity. It is evidently the production of a Roman Catholic.

XXII.—*She Loved Much: and The Hem of His Garment. Two Sermons. By* W. F. HOOK, *D.D., Vicar of Leeds.* London: Rivingtons.

THE preface to these sermons, which were preached at the re-opening of two churches, is remarkable as conveying the sentiments of their eminent author on recent occurrences. We shall offer no apology for making the following extracts:—

"The author has the more readily complied with the request that these sermons shall be published, because in a time of much public offence and suspicion, it seems incumbent upon those whose attachment to the distinctive principles of the Reformed Church of England is unalterable, to take every public opportunity of making their sentiments known. . . . We have lived to see men quitting without compunction that branch of the Catholic Church which God has planted in their native land, and betaking themselves to the schismatic sect intruded by the Bishop of Rome, with as little scruple or hesitation, as a man might feel in vacating one post of duty or preferment for another to which he

had been lawfully called. And such grievous and sinful acts are palliated by being styled by the milder term of secession, and not schism; a going forth to labour in another portion of the same vineyard, rather than a breaking down of the hedge of our own sacred enclosure. . . . There is another way of accounting for these secessions as they are called, which is still more shocking: it is said that the Church of Rome has gained possession of the perverted ones, in answer to the prayers which we have seen so often advertised as offered by persons and societies in that communion for the reduction of England to the Romish faith."

The following remarks are well worthy of attention:—

"I state these facts broadly, in the hope that on either side it may startle some, and lead the orthodox as well as the evangelical to ask themselves what is likely to be the end of this mutual hatred. I am myself as much convinced that there are among the evangelicals persons led by other feelings than self-indulgence and party spleen, as I am that there are multitudes of orthodox Churchmen, whose life is a pattern of self-denial, reverential fear, and love. The difference lies for the most part not in doctrine, but in different modes of applying the same doctrine; and this difference can soon be satisfactorily explained, if a spirit of love shall bring together those whom party leaders for their selfish ends labour to keep apart."

XXIII.—*The Statutes relating to the Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions of England and Wales, Ireland, India, and the Colonies; with the decisions thereon. By* ARCHIBALD JOHN STEPHENS, *Esq. Barrister at Law. In* 2 *vols.* London: Parker.

THE object of this elaborate work, is to supply, in a convenient form for reference, a complete collection of the Statutes relating to Ecclesiastical and Eleemosynary Institutions. The statutes are arranged in chronological order, beginning with 9th Hen. III. c. 1., and terminating with the 7th and 8th Vict. c. 108. Repealed statutes affecting existing interests are printed at full length. The titles of statutes affecting the Presbyterian establishment in Scotland have been introduced. The whole work is illustrated by elaborate notes, containing cases and references, and furnished with copious indices. Considering that the work extends to about 2,300 pages royal 8vo., printed in a very small type, the price seems to us very moderate. A supplement will be published each year, comprising the statutes and cases enacted and decided in the preceding year.

XXIV.—*Ecclesiastical Records of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the Fifth Century to the Reformation, &c. By the Rev.* RICHARD HART, *B.A. Vicar of Catton.* Cambridge: Macmillan.

THIS work is a digest of the contents of Wilkin's and Spelman's Concilia, arranged under various hands, and illustrated with notes exhibiting considerable research. The divisions are as follows: a discourse on the religion of the ancient Britons, Irish, and Scots.—On the mode of celebrating synods.—The origin and progress of the Papal power in England.—The hierarchy and clergy. The seven sacraments, and other ceremonies.—Liturgical and architectural antiquities.—Penance, indulgence, &c.; and civil laws.—Real or reputed heretics. There are also three well-executed plates, representing ecclesiastical vestments, Gothic tracery, ecclesiastical miscellaneous utensils, &c.

XXV.—*The Influence of Christianity in Promoting the Abolition of Slavery in Europe. By* CHURCHILL BABINGTON, *B.A.* Cambridge: Deighton.

THIS dissertation obtained the Hulsean Prize for the year 1845. The author has bestowed great pains on his subject, as is evident from the copious citations and references with which his pages abound. He admits that slavery is not inconsistent with the letter of Scripture, but argues that it is inconsistent with its spirit.

XXVI.—*Burns' Fireside Library.*

THE last volumes of this amusing and cheap miscellany that we have seen, are the romantic story of "The Magic Ring," by La Motte Fouqué, "Marco Visconti," by Grossi, "The Maid of Orleans," translated from Schiller, and "William Tell," by the same author. The first of these tales abounds in knightly adventures, witches, enchanters, Moors, &c., to the fullest limit of the requirements of romance. The translations from Schiller will be perused with pleasure by those who have made any acquaintance with the works of this eminent writer.

XXVII.—*Thirty-six Non-conformist Sonnets. By* A YOUNG ENGLANDER. London: Aylott and Jones.

WE apprehend that "Young England" will not be much gratified at the adoption of its name by the author of the sonnets before

us, who is a Dissenter. We must really find room for a specimen: it is warlike enough.

HEART OF OAK.

"Are we not English! Is it not enough
To prove we ne'er shall cringe beneath the sway
Of *a swoll'n priesthood?* Proudly do they say
They are ordained of God, with loud rebuff
To follow all who dare to disobey
Their lordly mandates, and with sternly rough
Unbending mien, they stand ready to *cuff*
Christ's heritage, and *blast* it, if they may.
Ye carnal! vainly do ye wait the day
For which so rancorous ye fume and puff;
Our swords are ready and our shields are tough,
And on our Lord we lean for all our stay.
Wherefore come on, in all your armed array,
And ye shall find that we are *solid stuff!*"

We are afraid there is a good deal of "solid stuff" in this "heart of oak." It would be desirable that the "Young Englander" should attend to his own lines on "Moderation and Firmness."

"Not with the bitterness of party zeal,
May we advance our hallow'd Lord's commands.
. . . . . Stigmatizing brand
Of Schism and Faction, and whatever stands
Across our steps to make our spirits reel
And stagger from their *coolness*, we must use
But as incentives to such worthy deeds
In our great cause," &c.

XXVIII.—PAMPHLETS, &c.

We have read with interest and pleasure the Charge delivered to the candidates for ordination, and a Sermon preached at the General Ordination by the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Two excellent sermons on "Parochial Subdivision" (Rivingtons) have been published, which were delivered by the Rev. Dr. Hook and the Rev. W. Dodsworth, at St. Paul's Church, Leeds, in aid of a fund for constituting that church a separate parish, under the Leeds Vicarage Act. We have also to notice, as deserving of attention, "The Church of England, Catholic and Apostolic in her doctrine and practice," a sermon by the Rev. A. Sayers, M.A., Rector of St. Mary de Crypt, Gloucester (Rivingtons); "The Corruptions and Idolatry of the Church of Rome," by the Rev.

J. Burwell, M.A., Incumbent of St. Philip's, Stepney (Bell), an able and sound discourse; "The Scriptural doctrine of the Holy Sacrament opposed to Transubstantiation," by the Rev. T. Robertson, A.M., late Senior Presidency Chaplain of Calcutta (Hatchards).

Mr. Gresley's pamphlet, "The real danger of the Church of England" (Burns), has attracted much attention, and deserves to be carefully examined. Mr. Gresley states it as his opinion, that the ultra-evangelical party are obtaining an influence in the Church which is calculated to be most injurious to her, and even to lead to the exclusion of persons of different theological tenets from her communion. Mr. Gresley enters into details on this subject, which are of great interest and importance.

A "Letter on the recent Schisms in Scotland," by the Rev. R. Montgomery, M.A. (Lendrum), and a "Letter to the Lord Bishop of Cashel," by Francis Gordon, M.A., Incumbent of St. Paul's Chapel, Edinburgh, both refer to the distressing divisions in Scotland, and are written with much force and ability. A second edition of "A few words on the Athanasian Creed, Justification by Faith, and the 9th and 17th Articles, by a Bishop's Chaplain," (London: Parker), has made its appearance. This pamphlet will be useful to candidates for orders. Mr. James, Vicar of Cobham, has published "A Vindication of the usage of closing the morning service with the Sermon" (Rivingtons), in reply to Archdeacon Harrison.

The Rev. John Miller, M.A., has published four Sermons, entitled "A Plain Christian's View of Fundamental Church Principles" (Rivingtons). They comprise a clear and satisfactory view of the position of the English Church, as it stands distinguished from Romanism and Dissent. "The Theory of Development examined," by the Rev. W. J. Irons, B.D. (Rivingtons), is an able and thoughful treatise on the subject of Mr. Newman's recent publication. "A Postscript" to "The English Church not in Schism," by the Rev. W. Brudenell Barter, M.A. (Rivingtons), relates to the same subject, and enters a vigorous protest against Mr. Newman's views. "A Few Words addressed to the Author of 'An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine,' by an Anglican Priest" (Hatchards), is written in an earnest and religious tone. The Rev. A. G. H. Hollingsworth has published two excellent letters on "The Folly of going to Rome for a Religion" (Hatchards). Amongst the most pleasing and valuable of all the publications which have appeared in reference to this subject is, "An Earnest Dissuasive from joining the Communion of the Church of Rome," by the Rev. H. Alford.

(Burns). We have perused this excellent pamphlet with unmingled pleasure, and recommend it strongly to our readers. "A Plea for the Church of England," &c. (Newcastle: Richardson), contains a selection of passages from our most eminent theologians, expressive of their attachment to the Church. The Rev. F. Merewether, M.A., has published a "Letter to Lord Charles S. Manners, M.P." (Rivingtons), which treats on the Maynooth Grant and cognate subjects, with clearness, elegance, and Christian principle and feeling.

"Parish Churches," by Raphael and Arthur Brandon, Architects (Bell), of which some numbers have appeared, comprises plans and elevations of ancient parish churches, with admeasurements, and, from the judicious selection which has been made of examples, bids fair to be a very useful publication to the architect and the parish priest.

"Sharpe's London Magazine" continues to maintain its character of being the cheapest and most entertaining of our minor periodicals.

We have much pleasure in directing attention to a very well-managed penny journal, "The Church Sunday School Magazine" (Leeds: Harrison. London: Rivingtons), which commenced in January, and is published monthly. It has already reached a third edition, and seems admirably fitted for circulation amongst Sunday schools and the poorer classes.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

General Colonial Church Statistics.—*Comparative Table of the Episcopate of the English Church and of the Romish Episcopate, in the Colonies and Foreign Dependencies of the British Empire.*—The following Table, compiled from authentic sources, showing the extent to which the papal jurisdiction is exercised within the colonies and foreign dependencies of the British Empire, will not be without interest, nor, we trust, without its use. Where the date of the erection of the bishoprics could be ascertained, it has been added :—

Countries.	*Bishops of the English Church.*	*Romish Bishops and Vicars Apostolic.*
North America.—Bp. of Nova Scotia, (1787.)		Bp. of Halifax, (1842.)
		Bp. of Maximinianopolis, Coadj.
		Bp. of Charlotte Town, Prince Edward's Island.
	Bp. of Montreal, (1793.)	Abp. of Quebec, (1674.)
		Bp. of Sidimo, Coadj.
		Bp. of Montreal, (1836.)
		A Coadjutor.
	Bp. of Toronto, (1839.)	Bp. of Kingstown, (1836.)
		Bp. of Toronto, (1841.)
	Bp. of Newfoundland, (1839.)	Bp. of Carpasien, V. A. of Newfoundland.
	Bp. of Fredericton, (1845.)	Bp. of New Brunswick, (1845.)[1]
		Bp. of Juliopolis, V. A. of Hudson's Bay.
		Bp. of Oregon, (1845.)
West Indies.—Bp. of Jamaica, (1824.)		Vicar Apost. of Jamaica.
Bp. of Barbados, (1824.)		Bp. of Agna, V. A. of Trinidad.
Bp. of Antigua, (1842.)		
South America.—Bp. of Guiana, (1842.)		Bp. of Leros, Admin. Ap. of British Guiana, (1844.)[2]
India.—Bp. of Calcutta, Metrop. (1814.)		Abp. of Edessa, V. A. of Bengal.
		Bp. of Milene, Coadj.
	Bp. of Madras, (1835.)	Bp. of Castoria, V. A. of Madras.
	Bp. of Bombay, (1837.)	Bp. of Calma, V. A. of Bombay.
		Bp. of Aureiopolis, Coadj.
	Bp. of Colombo, (1845.)	Bp. of Usula, V. A. of Ceylon.
		Bp. of Bethesda, V. A. of Thibet.
		Bp. of Almira, Coadj.

[1] Those marked (1845) are contained in the *Catholic Directory* for 1846, but not in that for 1845, and are therefore supposed to have been established during the last year.

[2] Those marked (1844) are found in the *Catholic Directory* for 1845, but not in the *Almanach du Clergé* for 1844.

Australasia.—Bp. of Australia, (1836.)		Abp. of Sydney, V. A. of New Holland, (1842.)
		Bp. of Adelaide, (1842.)
		Bp. of Perth, (1845.)
	Bp. of Tasmania, (1842.)	Bp. of Hobart Town, (1842.)
	Bp. of New Zealand, (1841.)	Bp. of Maronia, V. A. of Western Oceania.
Mediterranean Possessions.—Bp. of Gibraltar, (1842.)		Abp. of Rhodes and Bp. of Malta.
		Bp. of Eliopolis, V. A. of Gibraltar, (1844.)
		Abp. of Corfu [3].
		Bp. of Zante and Cephalonia.
Africa.—		Bp. of Eucarpia, V. A. of Upper and Lower Guinea.
		Bp. of Paleopolitano, V. A. of Southern Africa.
		Bp. of Milevis, V. A. of the Mauritius.

Summary.		English Bishops		Romish Bishops	
	North America	——	5	——	13
	West Indies	——	3	——	2
	South America	——	1	——	1
	India	——	4	——	8
	Australasia	——	3	——	5
	Mediterranean Possessions	——	1	——	4
	Africa	——	0	——	3
	Total ——	——	17	——	36

France.—*The Church and the University.*—The French Government is making strenuous efforts to bring about an amicable adjustment of the *vexata quæstio* of education. Soon after it became known that, by the negotiation of M. Rossi at Rome, the voluntary dissolution of the Jesuit congregations established in France had been obtained [4], it became evident that the Government must, in some manner or other, which did not meet the eye, have succeeded in satisfying the Ultramontane party. The communications which passed between the Minister of Public Instruction and the *Collège de France* [5], indicated a disposition to curb the aggressive spirit of the *parti universitaire;* and what has since occurred, can leave no doubt as to the determination of the ministry of Louis Philippe to keep on fair terms with the Romish clergy, even at the risk of affronting and alienating the philosophical oligarchy which, till very lately, presided over the University. Considering the violence of the outcry which the former had raised with reference to the proposed expulsion of the Jesuits, and the hostile attitude which, on more than one previous occasion, the episcopate had assumed, the sudden lulling of the storm, and the comparatively peaceable language adopted by the Church party, betokened some great change in the political atmosphere; while, at the same time, the uneasy and irritable temper of mind betrayed by the great luminaries of the philosophical

[3] This see is omitted in the *Catholic Directory*, but it is given, with its occupant, in the *Almanach du Clergé*.

[4] See English Review, Vol. IV. p. 238, &c.

[5] See English Review, Vol. IV. p. 240.

school showed that they had no longer the same confidence in the identity of the cause of the University with that of the State. Several occurrences, in themselves of no very great importance, threw light on the new situation in which the different parties stood to each other. First came a foolish quarrel, which M. Libri contrived to pick with the Minister of Public Instruction. He was in ill health, and wished to lecture by deputy; he applied for leave to do so, and as the answer did not arrive as quickly as he expected, he paraded himself in the public journals as an ill-used man, the victim of the animosity and secret influence of the Romish party. It turned out that the document granting him the required leave had actually been made out, and that some luckless clerk was the only person to blame for the delay; M. Libri therefore, having received a rebuff from the minister, and some rough handling in the ministerial journals, was allowed to retire from the stage.

The next prelude was enacted by M. Quinet, in a style somewhat more dignified. When the time arrived for the re-opening of the courses at the *Collège de France*, M. Quinet handed in a *programme*, in which he announced his intention of lecturing on "*the literature and the institutions*, compared with each other, of the nations of Southern Europe." M. de Salvandy, remembering the geographical position of the eternal city, did not think that there was much of the sound of peace in the *programme*, and accordingly suggested, that as M. Quinet was properly speaking professor of literature, he had better keep to his department, and, after the fashion of his colleagues, lecture on *the language and the literature* of the nations of Southern Europe. With this suggestion M. Quinet refused to comply, and as M. de Salvandy was equally positive, and the day for publicly notifying the courses had arrived, the announcement was reduced to the simplest possible form, viz. that M. Quinet would deliver his course, without specifying on what subject. Thus ended, for the present, the official conflict: the college youths, however, were not satisfied with so lame a termination of the exciting incident; they assembled to the number, some say of 300, others of 2000, for the purpose of making a "demonstration." They first proceeded to M. Quinet's residence, where one of them made a speech, assuring the professor, that in their opinion he had always strictly adhered to his subject, and that if he was opposed by a few '*obscurantistes en retard*,' he had the sympathies of the universal youth of France on his side. In his reply M. Quinet boasted that he had convicted his religious enemies that they did not wish for Christianity, and driven his political opponents to the strange avowal, that they could no longer tolerate, even in a *programme*, the word "institutions." He therefore thought the day was his own, and advised his young friends to go home peaceably. They, however, very undutifully thought fit to go round by the *rue Cassette*, and vociferate, *A bas les Jésuites! Vive Quinet!* for the special benefit of M. de Salvandy, who lives in that street; and having given some further indications of a riotous mood in the *Place de l' Ecole de Médecine*, they were ultimately dispersed by the police, who committed some of the most noisy to

durance vile. The journals protracted the feud for a little while longer; the liberal prints bespattered M. de Salvandy with their abuse, the *Journal des Débats* insinuated that possibly M. Quinet might find it easier to fling out a few clap-trap phrases on the glories of the French revolution, and the iniquities of popery, than set forth, which was his proper business, the beauties of Dante or Calderon; and the *Univers* laughed, and declared that the worst that could befall M. Quinet, if he would not lecture upon a curtailed *programme*, would be to draw his salary for nothing, and eat the bread of idleness.

While, however, these skirmishes were in progress, M. de Salvandy came down upon the refractory men of literature with artillery of a very different calibre, which he had silently prepared. On the 7th of December a royal ordinance put an end to the existence of the council of the University, and reconstructed it, under the name of *Conseil royal de l'Université*, on an entirely new basis. The ordinance is preceded in the *Moniteur* by a report of M. de Salvandy to the king, which, as it contains a brief history of the University from its first foundation by Napoleon, and explains the nature of the present alteration, will be read with interest:

"Sire,—The events of 1815 threatened the existence of the University; they deranged every part of the institution to an extent which is felt to the present time; and they moreover altered essentially the legal constitution of the council placed at its head. They struck at its organization, at its rules, and at its very name. They cut off from it the aid of a numerous representation of all the branches of its instruction, and all the departments of its service. In fact, they gave it only a provisional existence, and stamped that character upon it so strongly, that all its deliberations necessarily bear the impress of it to this day. I ask your Majesty to put an end to this state of things. It is important, before any discussion on the conditions of freedom of teaching shall take place, that the constitution of the public system of teaching should be settled upon a perfectly certain basis.

"The University was established on the principle of two distinct powers: a Grand Master, whose business it is, in the words of the organic decree, to *govern* and to *rule* the whole (art. 50); and a Council, instituted to watch over *the improvement of the studies, the police of the schools, the financial concerns, and the discipline* (art. 75).

"The Grand Master appoints to all the offices, dispenses all the distinctions, and effects all the promotions in the body of the instructors (art. 51). He exercises a limited portion of the disciplinary jurisdiction (art. 57). He convokes and presides over the Council (art. 61). He appoints to the presidency two eminent dignitaries, the chancellor of the University, and the Treasurer who superintends all its financial concerns (art. 66). He divides the counsellors into sections, and refers to the several sections the matters on which he wishes them to report (art. 75). He proposes to the general assembly all the drafts of regulations and statutes intended to be enacted for different degrees of schools (art. 60).

"The Council, on the other hand, attends to whatever concerns the improvement of the studies (art. 75). It takes cognizance of all the questions relative to the police and the general administration of the schools (art. 77). It alone can inflict severe punishments, especially that of expulsion (art. 79). It admits or rejects the works that are to be put into the hands of the young (art. 80). It decides upon all contentious questions, whether relating to the establishments of the University, or to its members (art. 81). As it deliberates upon all the regulations which emanate from the Grand Master, and never exercises administrative powers, it is the guardian of all rights as well as of all traditions; and its constitution requires that it should be sufficiently numerous, and undergo sufficient renovation, to insure its efficiency in promoting every kind of improvement.

"In reality, the Council is to be composed of thirty members, to admit of their being distributed into sections for the despatch of minor matters, and for the preparation of more important business, with a view to decision in a general assembly and after real debates. This organization comprises titular or life counsellors, and ordinary counsellors; the former constitute the permanent representation of the University; the twenty ordinary counsellors, appointed annually by the Grand Master, but chosen by him in certain definite and often unchangeable categories, cost the state nothing in their capacity as members of the council, because this title is conferred on them as the complement and the reward of their labours, and they have the advantage of being in the daily practice of applying, as inspectors general, as rectors, as deans of faculties, or as masters of royal colleges, the regulations on which they are called upon to deliberate. In this system of inspection, that useful service which causes the central authority to be present every where, brings to bear upon every matter knowledge gained on the spot. The University knows that every order of studies is represented, and that by several organs. There are conflicting debates and an efficient control.

"This Constitution, so perfectly balanced that it seems as if established in anticipation of the wants and maxims of a free government, had been founded by the law of May the 5th, 1806, and organized by the special decree of March the 17th, 1808, which by the terms of the constitutional acts of the empire has force of law, and has been so recognised by the decisions of the courts and tribunals, both before and since 1830. A royal ordinance of Feb. 15th, 1815, on the eve of the 20th of March, declared *all the existing institutions having reference to instruction* abolished, in order to *substitute, for the principle of one central authority, the principle of local authorities*, and to create seventeen provincial Universities, independent of each other, and connected with the State only by the medium of a *Royal Council of Public Instruction*, which was to have been established for superintending both the discipline and the teaching. The 20th of March cut all these plans short before they could be carried into effect. All that remained of this attempt was a long-continued subversion of the established order.

"After the hundred days, indeed, an ordinance of August the 15th, 1815, *willing to forbear from all important innovations until a definitive system might be established, decided that all the Academies were to be* PROVISIONALLY MAINTAINED. The name of the University continued abrogated. *A Commission of Public Instruction*, consisting of five, and afterwards of seven members, was to combine in its hands *the powers formerly committed both to the Grand Master and to the Council of the University;* powers of so different a nature, as to render it impossible to unite and to amalgamate them, without removing all guarantees; because all control and all responsibility was thus at once abolished. The number of royal commissioners being so small, and the ordinary counsellors having been suppressed, the attributes of the Council and of the Grand Master became alike extinct. A kind of *Directoire* was substituted for this twofold authority.

"The president of the Commission was M. Royer Collard; its members were M. Cuvier, M. de Sacy, M. de Frayssinous, M. Gueneau de Mussy. It happened to these men, of minds so differently constituted, as it has ever since happened to all who have reflected upon these important questions; they comprehended that in the actual state of France, considering all that time has destroyed, and all that it has founded, the magistracy of public instruction, called the University, is necessary for ensuring the essential conditions of order, maintaining the unity of the French mind, and by degrees raising the standard of instruction. They applied themselves to the gradual preservation of the institution, for the overthrow of which they had been called in. They succeeded. After five years appeared the ordinance of November the 1st, 1820, by which the royal authority, *willing to establish the direction and administration of the body of instructors upon a more settled basis, and to* PAVE THE WAY FOR A DEFINITIVE ORGANIZATION, authorized the commission, *in testimony of the satisfactory nature of its services, to* RESUME *the rank and the costume of the council of the University;* it conferred on it the title of ROYAL COUNCIL OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION; for the name 'University,' though admitted in the transaction of current business, was not yet reinstated at the head of the institution. The counsellors were to exercise, *ad interim*, the functions of chancellor, treasurer, secretary-general, which had constituted part of the attributes of the real council. At the same time they continued to exercise together the functions of Grand Master; only, instead of exercising them conjointly, they distributed them among themselves. Each administered a branch of the service, and had thus a separate, independent, and irresponsible department in the general department of the University.

"This organization, Sire, still continues to exist, although the restoration shortly after took another step, that of formally recognizing the University by the ordinance of June the 1st, 1822, which re-established the office of Grand Master, but without restoring to the council its rules or its name, or to the Grand Master his regular attributes and his indispensable supports. At a later period the head of the University united with this title that of minister of public instruction (August

the 26th, 1824), but still the administration of the University was not brought into harmony with the principles of constitutional responsibility. In order to make some approach to this, it became necessary for M. Vatimesnil to provide, by an ordinance (of March 26th, 1829), which bears his name in the University, that a part of the deliberations of the Council, those of an administrative character, should require the approbation of the responsible minister. While the royal authority had prevailed on itself to rest its acts upon the decrees by which the University was constituted, the royal council still sprang from the ordinances which had abrogated those decrees. It had, in fact, a twofold origin: it was the council of the University, forasmuch as it enjoyed the rights and prerogatives attached to this title, and at the same time, notwithstanding the existence of the Grand Master, it was the royal commission, forasmuch as it took part in the management of the *personnel* and in the administration, and continued limited in the number of its members.

"This state of things has since the year 1830 given rise to constant protests in the Chambers; session after session it has been brought under discussion. Legislative commissions have, in special reports, called for the legal reconstitution of the council, and the recomposition, around the eminent men which compose it, of that useful assembly, which together with them ought to form the regular representation of the body of instructors. The administration of 1838 announced its intention to comply with this wish, in a general circular of July the 17th, 1838.

"'I shall,' said the minister, 'in performance of the duty imposed upon me by the seventy-first article of the decree, which constitutes the University, make out the list of ordinary counsellors therein prescribed. It will be the complement and the sequel to the act by which I have restored to the inspectors general the right of taking their seat in the royal council, in order to receive their instructions, and to render an account of their mission, in the presence of the permanent chiefs of the University. The last traces of the long-continued derangement, occasioned by the ordinances of 1815, will thus be effaced. We shall have returned to the regular course prescribed by the constitution of the University. Considering the general state of our institutions, and the principle inscribed in the charter of 1830, nothing could be more urgent than its restoration in all those points in which any departure from it still remained.'

"A report to the king, laid on the table of the Chambers, on the 31st December, 1838, at the head of the law on finance, announced the same intentions, and developed the same ideas:

"'When your Majesty did me the honour of calling me to the head of this department, I professed the principle, that public instruction is actually established; that the freedom of instruction, required by the charter, is not only compatible with the maintenance of the body of the University, but is practicable only by means of it; owing to its constitution, which is framed with sufficient strength to preserve to the

State, amidst all possible competition, its legitimate ascendancy in matters of education and instruction. Before establishing that system, it was necessary to resettle in all its parts the University, shaken as it was by so many irregularities and uncertainties. One point alone requires to be set in order; which is, the completion and regulation of the Council, in order to put an end to constantly repeated protests, beyond the reach of which it is time that the Council should be placed. The traces of the unconstitutional acts of 1815 will thus be definitively effaced.'

"Sire, all that has taken place during the six years since elapsed, has only tended to justify and to strengthen these views. Your Majesty will judge that the moment has arrived for completing your work, and for causing the last traces of derangements of a now distant date to vanish. The legal constitution of the University must be unquestionable in the debates by which our public laws on the subject of instruction are to be determined.

"I maintain, Sire, that the first organization of the Council is not only regular, but excellent. It has the special merit of being adapted to our present circumstances. We behold our nation, which has undergone so much agitation of principles and discussion of its institutions, fall back upon itself in the midst of its immense prosperity and freedom, and consider, and that justly, all those questions of paternal right, the questions of instruction, of education, of methods and degrees, as involving the first interests of the State. The most complicated and most serious problems are proposed to us. In the midst of a new order of things, in an entirely new state of society, we are to determine what, under the influence of so many changes, public education ought to be, in its relation to the interests of civilization, to the rights of the State, and those of the family. Several commissions have already under consideration essential questions, which ought to be discussed and resolved by the Council of the University. In order to enter upon them, the Council needs all the strength promised to it by the law of its organization.

"The actual council of public instruction consists of only eight members, and several are wanting to its labours. A less indefatigable devotion would succumb to the distracting effect of the daily labour of their administrative functions, and of that constant personal superintendence of the studies, which constitutes their essential mission. Every one is aware that names of greater distinction are not known to literature and science; but even if they were all present, numerous branches of instruction and service would be unrepresented[6]. Those which are

[6] We are not sure that we quite understand the drift of this passage. M. de Salvandy seems in a strait betwixt the necessity of stating strongly the utter inefficiency of the present council, and his anxiety by good words and fair speeches to avert the philosophic wrath of the victims of his reforming zeal. As far as we can see, he means to say, that out of the eight members there are some who do not work at all, while the others work unreasonably hard, and after all they work to little purpose, owing to the distracting nature of their duties; that, in fact, great men as they undoubtedly are, they are of little use.

represented, are so by one person only ; of such high eminence, it is true, that his authority is surely sufficient to resolve all difficulties, but without that control and debate between equals, which is one of the guarantees required in every thing by our present institutions, and provided for by anticipation in the constitution of the University. Under our constitutional system, all interests are entitled to the benefit of conflicting debates, and every body is bound to submit to these.

" I said in 1838, and have pleasure in repeating it, that the royal council, with the light and the zeal which shine at its head, has rendered immense services : it has saved the University under the Restoration; since 1830, it has maintained and strengthened it. To seek for the re-establishment of its regular state, is to render it homage, Sire, because it is to accomplish its task; a complete return to the legal order of things is agreeable to the nature of our government; it will give additional guarantees both for persons and things, for the security of the families, and for the power and dignity of the institution.

" With these views, Sire, I have the honour to propose to your Majesty a second ordinance, which has for its object, to restore the academic councils, those tribunals of the twenty-seven jurisdictions of the University, to that state of permanency which is agreeable to the spirit of their institution, setting to their number a uniform and definite limit. The instability to which they have, subsequently to the organic decree, been reduced, has often been the subject of impeachment in both the chambers. It is in the nature of our institutions, and in the spirit of our government, that all interests and rights should be duly guaranteed.

" Thus, Sire, your Majesty will have accomplished your work of restoration completely. Always liable to reform by regulation or by law, our vast system of public instruction will have recovered its rules, its strength, and its stability. The head of a department of the public service which presses so heavily upon the mind and conscience, will be supported in his endeavours to carry that burden, by numerous representatives of the University, men of special information, as well as men of illustrious name. Aided by every kind of knowledge, and invested with all his attributes, he may with justice be made constitutionally answerable for all the acts which he may order, and all the directions which he may give; and happy will he be, to whom such mighty powers are committed, if the institution thus reduced to rule and stability, shall under his care become strong in the public esteem and confidence, by greater and greater efficiency in training up sound and enlightened generations, worthy of the past recollections of France, nurtured in the spirit of her present institutions, and giving fair promise for her future material and moral greatness !"

The royal ordinances which followed this report, provided for the complete execution of the views developed in it ; the staff of the council was put upon an effective footing ; and on the 16th of December M. de Salvandy presided over its first session. There was an end at once of the exclusive and irresponsible power of the eight (or rather,

by reason of absence and illness, only five or six) oligarchs of the University, who had divided the different departments between them, and exercised, each in his own, the most despotic sway over their subordinates, while in their corporate capacity they were determined to maintain, and to diffuse all over France by means of the immense machinery of tuition at their command, the anti-christian spirit which, in the person of the eclectic philosopher M. Cousin, presided over their deliberations.

Considered merely as a step towards the improvement of the notoriously defective system of public instruction in France, the measure of M. de Salvandy is one of great consequence and of high promise; but its chief importance consists in the greater facility which it gives to the government in controlling the action of the University, and, as the government seems to hope, adapting it to the requirements of a religious as well as literary and scientific education. As might be supposed, an act of power so unexpected and so decisive was not allowed to pass unnoticed by those with whose prerogatives it interfered, when the opportunity of canvassing it had arrived. No sooner was the debate on the address commenced in the Chamber of Peers, than M. Cousin mounted the *tribune*, and attacked the ordinances in a speech of great animation and power. He designated them as "an act prepared by the minister in the dark," which, he added, "he considered fatal to a great institution which he had served for thirty-five years, and was determined to defend to the last extremity;" lastly, he called in question the legality of the proceeding of M. de Salvandy, and maintained that the legislative power of the Chambers alone could alter the organization of the council of the University. In the Chamber of Deputies the onset was still more violent; M. Thiers brought all his eloquence to bear against the ministerial measure, which was defended not only by M. de Salvandy himself, but by M. Guizot, who took a most comprehensive view of the present situation of France in reference to the momentous question of education. This was the point on which he chiefly relied for the justification of the course pursued by his colleague. He insisted strongly on the despotic origin of the University, and on its essentially despotic character, claiming for the State an absolute control over the education of the rising generations, in violation of what he maintained to be the prior rights of the parents, and the distinct rights of religious belief. After passing in review the history of the University, he adverted to the conflict between the Church and the University, by which France had for several years been distracted, and revealed the mainspring of the ministerial policy in these remarkable words:—

"Gentlemen,—It is the duty of the government, as it is for the interest of society at large, when such a conflict arises, to put an end to it as speedily as possible; it is the duty of the government not to take part in the conflict, but to rise above it, to dominate and to pacify; this is the true task which the government has to perform. The government is not to raise one of these two great moral forces above the other, or to sacrifice one to the other; it is not to give to the University a victory over the clergy, or to the clergy a victory over the University; no, its

duty is to rise above them both, to dominate and to pacify them." This he announced to be the determination of the present government of France to do; and he gave, as to its intentions on the general question of education, the following pledge:—

"The king's government is firmly resolved upon three points. The government is firmly resolved to execute sincerely the promises of the Charter. It is firmly resolved to maintain the rights of the State in regard to public instruction. It is firmly resolved also to maintain religious peace, together with religious liberty and freedom of thought, the combination of which is the glory of our social condition. The king's government will not suffer religious liberty or the freedom of thought to be violated, it will not suffer the religious peace to be disturbed."

That these intentions are both upright and sincere, no one can doubt; but it may be permitted to ask, considering the character of the parties with whom it has to deal, whether the king's government will be able to accomplish all that it is so firmly resolved to do, and to prevent all that it is so firmly resolved to eschew. It has obtained a truce; but will it succeed in establishing peace? "The position which the government means to assume," says the *Espérance*, "is full of difficulty and of danger. The government cannot reconcile things in their nature irreconcilable; the task which it has undertaken is beside its duty, and beyond its power."

State Support of the Romish Church.—The ecclesiastical budget of the present year makes considerable additions to that of the preceding year. An increase of 20,000 francs is appropriated to the Protestant communion; and an increase of 289,800 francs to the Romish Church, distributed among the following objects; 14,000 francs for raising 35 *succursales* into *cures;* 240,000 francs for the erection of 300 new *succursales;* 35,800 francs for the employment of additional *vicaires* or assistant ministers. The number of students at the ecclesiastical seminary of the diocese of Paris has been raised from 250 to 450; a proportionate reduction has been directed in the numbers of several provincial seminaries. The missionary seminary of the "*Saint-Esprit*" has undergone a complete reformation, with a view to its greater efficiency; it contains at present 46 students maintained by the state; and in addition to this a novitiate has been established for the reception of priests who desire to devote themselves to the missionary work, and who have the opportunity afforded them of passing through a preparatory course. A comprehensive ecclesiastical organization of the colonies of France is said to be under the consideration of government.

GERMANY.—*Menacing attitude of the Romish Church.* In Germany, as elsewhere, it is becoming daily more evident that the Romish Church entertains the most sanguine hopes of restoration to her former condition of power and ascendancy. No opportunity of asserting the claims of Rome against the existing laws and governments is lost sight of by the Romish hierarchy, which not only does not shrink

from open conflict with the temporal powers, but appears to court that conflict, and to exult in the embarrassments which it produces. In Rhenish Prussia, the flame kindled under the late reign by the recently (October 19, 1845) deceased Archbishop of Cologne, Baron Clement Augustus Droste Vischering, has broken out afresh, and is fanned in the diocese of Münster by the brother, and in the diocese of Cologne by the successor, of that haughty prelate, whose boldness and constancy in the maintenance of the principles of his Church gained for him during his lifetime such flattering distinction from the Roman Pontiff, and after his death a commemorative allocution to the Sacred College[7]. In Münster the quarrel turns upon that fruitful source of litigation between Church and State, the education question. In opposition to the order established throughout Prussia, according to which the state has the superintendence of public education, and the appointment of the teachers, the Bishop of Münster, Baron Maximilian Droste Vischering, claimed the right of appointment, and exercised it with regard to several schools for children of both sexes. The provincial government disputed his competency, and as the bishop persisted in his claim, closed the schools in question. The bishop

[7] This allocution was delivered in the secret consistory of the 24th of November last, and dilates on "the bright example" left by the late archbishop, for the edification not only of those of his own communion, but of "those also that are without." After enumerating his virtues, among which his "*summus ardor religionis, summa constantia, summus rerum humanarum contemptus,*" are not forgotten, the allocution adverts to his intended elevation to the cardinalship, and thus continues: "But he who according to our desire should have been an ornament to this apostolic see, is now, as we fully trust, established by God in his heavenly home, by the merits of his only-begotten Son, the eternal chief Shepherd. This we are led to hope assuredly, on the ground of that same distinguished virtue which we have beheld with admiration in the Archbishop of Cologne. For if, according to the apostolic admonition, we are not to sorrow for them which are asleep, even as others which have no hope, what must we think of a man who, before he fell asleep, was by the brightness of his virtue made a spectacle to the world, and to angels and to men? Known to all is that invincible courage with which he laboured to assert the purity of the Catholic religion, and of the discipline of the Church, even under great difficulties. Having therefore fought the good fight of faith, was he not to expect at the hands of the righteous Judge Christ Jesus the crown of righteousness which is laid up for all who fight strenuously and lawfully? Yet, forasmuch as the judgments of God are a great deep, although we be most confident (*etsi maximopere confidamus*) that the deceased archbishop, being delivered from the darkness of this miserable life, has already attained to the blessed light above, although this our strong confidence be our common consolation, nevertheless, if by reason of man's frailty, there be any thing still to be expiated by him (*si quid ex humana fragilitate adhuc illi expiandum supersit*), we make our humble supplication to God the Father of mercies, and are persuaded you will do the same, that He may graciously vouchsafe to purge the blemishes of his soul with the precious blood of the immaculate Lamb, the Redeemer of mankind, in order that this great archbishop may as speedily as possible (*quam citissime*) receive the unfading crown of glory, and may, even as on earth he was illustrious and bright, so in heaven also, together with all them that turn many to righteousness, shine as a star for ever and ever." As a practical specimen of the Romish notions of the good fight of faith, of the efficacy of human merit, and withal of the uncertainty of the Christian hope, this peroration on the merits of the departed archbishop, and his probable state in the unseen world, is truly a remarkable document.

thereupon issued injunctions to his clergy, in support of his episcopal right of superintendence over the education of the people; to which the provincial government replied by a circular addressed to the clergy, who are thus placed between the conflicting mandates of the spiritual and the temporal authority. The schools which gave rise to the dispute still remain shut up, as the government cannot find competent Roman Catholic teachers for them, six out of seven who were nominated having refused to accept the office otherwise than at the bishop's hands. The bishop has appealed against the acts of the provincial government to the king in council.

While this is going on in Westphalia, another quarrel of a similar nature has been fastened upon the government by Mgr. Johann von Geissel, formerly coadjutor, and since successor of the late Archbishop of Cologne. Here the question turns, not upon the education of the people, but upon that of the clergy. Not satisfied with the extent of the power hitherto exercised by the diocesan over the theological faculty of Bonn, and the *Convictorium*, or ecclesiastical seminary established in that University for the education of the Romish priesthood, Mgr. von Geissel refused to recognize them as diocesan institutions, and consequently to accept the students prepared by them as candidates for the priesthood. This measure, besides answering the purpose of a practical protest against what the archbishop considers an encroachment upon his diocesan rights, was intended to serve as an excuse for introducing into the diocese young men educated at Rome, whose ultra-montane principles, it was hoped, might counteract and in course of time expel the Hermesian school, which has still a strong hold upon the University of Bonn, and the clergy educated there. By way of reprisals, and to prevent the expatriation of young men for the purpose of receiving a clerical education at Rome, the Prussian government refused to acknowledge the *status ecclesiasticus* conferred at Rome, as the archbishop repudiated that conferred at Bonn. A cabinet order was issued, declaring all ecclesiastics educated abroad disentitled to the exemption from military service, which young men in holy orders, or in course of preparation for them, enjoy. The result of this order, if carried into execution, would be, that on their return from Rome, if drawn according to the Prussian law of conscription, the young ecclesiastics would have to shoulder the musket, and to serve in the ranks of the army, instead of those of the Church militant. Beaten from his position by this extra-ecclesiastic move of the government, yet unshaken as to his main purpose, the archbishop has in his Lent pastoral made an appeal to the liberality of his flock, calling on them to raise funds for the erection of four ecclesiastical seminaries, which he proposes to found with a view to a sufficient supply of clergy educated within the diocese. So much for the deference shown to the royal rights of Frederick William, in return for the good-natured concessions, and the liberal support lavished by him upon his Roman Catholic subjects, and more particularly upon those of the archdiocese of Cologne, and the Rhenish provinces generally.

Not less determined is the stand which ultra-montanism is making in

the south of Germany, for that which is in fact its ultimate object, the substantial establishment of the supremacy of Rome, to the subversion of all national legislation, and of the authority of temporal princes. In the kingdom of Würtemberg there is a feud of long standing between the government and the Romish hierarchy. The head of the hierarchy in that country is the Bishop of Rothenburg, whose advanced age and great bodily infirmity, (he was blind, and at the time of his death, October 17, 1845, only two days before that of the Archbishop of Cologne, had completed his 81st year,) afforded the government of Würtemberg for some years past an opportunity of fortifying its position against Rome. Under these circumstances the appointment of a coadjutor had been repeatedly urged, but to this the government would not consent, unless the choice fell upon a person of moderate views. The death of the bishop has at length brought the matter to a decisive issue. In the election of a successor, the influence of the government prevailed; the Diocesan Chapter put in nomination one of its own canons, Von Ströbele, the author of two publications by which he rendered himself obnoxious to the ultra-montane party. The first of these is a pamphlet on mixed marriages, which he published anonymously in the year 1842, recommending a moderate course, with a view to an amicable adjustment of that difficult question, which was then, as it still is, in dispute; the second is a Catholic Manual of chants and prayers in the German language, for the use of the diocese, which has in a great measure already superseded the Romish ritual with its Latin text. No sooner was his election made known, than the ultra-montane party got up "petitions against his return," addressed to the Pope, entreating him to refuse canonical institution to the bishop elect. These petitions were circulated among the people, for the purpose of obtaining signatures to them; a course which afforded the government an excellent opportunity of interfering for the protection of canonical order, and the rights of the chapter, by directing the civil authorities to seize the petitions, wherever they made their appearance. The contemplated demonstration will therefore be a failure; and the remonstrants will have to seek the private ear of his Holiness, for the purpose of pouring their complaints into it. The result is looked for with great anxiety; but in whichever way the Pope may decide, the ultra-montane party will scarcely be a gainer; for, as the *Univers* justly sums up the dilemma, if M. Von Ströbele is confirmed, he will use his then unquestionable authority in support of the views of the government, and the liberal portion of the Romish clergy; if he is not confirmed, the government will have sufficient ground of complaint to push matters, if necessary, to an open rupture, the consequences of which, at this critical moment, it is impossible to calculate.

Rather better success than that which the ultra-montane party has thus had in Würtemberg, through the great disadvantage entailed upon it by the incapacity of the late bishop, has attended the endeavours of the Archbishop of Freiburg to engage the grand ducal government of Baden in what he hoped would prove an unequal conflict. Here the

quarrel is of comparatively recent origin. Regardless of the legal provisions respecting the education of the issue of marriages between Roman Catholics and Protestants, the archbishop sent forth a circular to his clergy, dated January 3rd, 1845, in which he directed them, in every case of mixed marriages, to apply for special directions to the *ordinariat* of the archdiocese. The *animus* of this order soon became manifest, inasmuch as, in every case so submitted to the diocesan authority, the order was given to refuse the sacerdotal benediction, unless the parties wishing to contract marriage agreed to bring up all the children in the Romish faith. The government of Baden forbore at first to interfere with the archiepiscopal circular, in order, no doubt, to watch the practical working of the reference to the *ordinariat* enjoined by it; but on the 3rd of June a government order was issued, pronouncing the archiepiscopal circular invalid, on the ground that it had not been submitted, as by the law of the land it ought to have been, to the government previous to its publication. This decision was notified to the archbishop, and, at the same time, the government expressed its readiness to confer with him, as to any modifications of the existing law of mixed marriages which might be desirable. The only answer which the archbishop condescended to make, was a repetition of his former illegal proceeding, by the issue of another circular to the clergy on the 10th of August, in which he went still further, and, without circumlocution, directed the clergy to apply, in all cases, the rules laid down by the *ordinariat* in the individual cases referred to it in pursuance of the circular of the 3rd of January. Of the issue of this document the archbishop gave the government official notice, stating the grounds on which he rested his proceedings, and declared that he was quite prepared to follow the example of the Archbishop of Cologne, if the government would imitate that of the late King of Prussia. The rules laid down by the archbishop being directly opposed to the law of the land, which prohibits all pre-contracts on the subject, and more particularly all clerical interference with a view to obtain such pre-contracts, and the promulgation of them by the archbishop being, on the same grounds as the previous circular, illegal, the government issued another order, by which the clergy are warned of the illegality of the archbishop's injunctions, and, under reference to the law of the land, directed to obey the latter, and to disregard the former, under pain of incurring the penalties provided in such cases. Against this ministerial decree the archbishop protested in the strongest terms, declaring that he should hold no further communication with the government on the subject, but that he had laid the whole case before the court of Rome. He has since followed up his previous mandates to his clergy by a new set of injunctions, strictly prohibiting his clergy from admitting, as has long been the practice, Protestants as sponsors; a prohibition which, however justifiable in itself, indicates, by the moment chosen for issuing it, the spirit by which the archbishop is animated, and must necessarily tend to increase the irritation already existing between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics. The practical result of the conflicting

orders issued by their temporal and their spiritual rulers is, that a great number, the Romish papers assert a vast majority, of the clergy, violate the law of the land, in obedience to the archbishop; while the government, naturally reluctant to visit them for an offence committed under a sense of duty, and, no doubt, unwilling to push matters to an extremity, looks on inactive and irresolute. The difficulty in which the government has thus been placed has been greatly aggravated by the attempt of the liberal party in the chambers to force upon the government the recognition of the German Catholics of the Ronge school; a measure to which the government itself was averse, but which, being strongly supported in the lower chambers, called forth a reaction in favour of Church principles, sufficiently decisive to induce the government to dissolve the chambers, and appeal by a new election to the sense of the people. The prospect of the embarrassments likely to ensue on the meeting of the new chambers, and of a renewal of hostilities between the government and the archbishop, has since occasioned the dissolution of the ministry also.

An imitation on a small scale of the ecclesiastico-political dramas thus enacted in the more considerable states of Germany, has been got up in the free city of Frankfort, the seat of the Germanic diet. A Roman Catholic lady who is married to a Protestant, having been urged by her confessor to have her children educated in the Romish faith, and having pleaded her duty of conjugal obedience as her reason for non-compliance with his demand, was refused absolution by him. The affair was, through the influence of her husband, brought before the senate; the clergyman being called on for an explanation of his conduct, declined giving any, under shelter of the sanctity of the confessional. Thereupon the senate addressed to the Bishop of Limburg, the diocesan, a request for the removal of the confessor; but to this the bishop refused to accede, as he had not contravened his ecclesiastical duty. The matter was next referred by the senate to the Great Council, which decreed the forcible expulsion of the clergyman from the territory of Frankfort. The latter, acting under the direction of his bishop, declared that he would only yield to actual force, and was accordingly transported in the custody of the police beyond the frontier. This incident, in itself insignificant, derives considerable importance from the fact, that an appeal to the Germanic Diet is in contemplation, which will probably compel that assembly to enter upon the consideration of the many knotty questions which arise out of the juxta-position of Roman Catholics and Protestants all over Germany.

Symptoms of an Ecclesiastical Reform among the Roman Catholics of Southern Germany.—High as the Archbishop of Freiburg carries his head in his opposition to the grand ducal government of Baden, he has within the extent of his province, which includes the bishopric of Rothenburg, abundant cause for misgivings as to the success of his ultra-montane aspirations. We have already noticed in a former Number of our Review[8] the prevalence, among the clergy of the south-

[8] See English Review, Vol. IV. p. 251.

west of Germany, of the views and principles of Baron *Von Wessenberg*, formerly administrator of the diocese of Constance, who contemplated the foundation of a national Catholic Church, not in the sense of Ronge, but in the spirit of true, orthodox, and ecclesiastical reform, and who, but for the strenuous exertions of Austria and Bavaria, and the consummate ability of Cardinal Gonsalvi, would probably have carried his point at the Congress of Vienna. How averse the feelings of this large portion of the clergy of the province of Freiburg are to the tendencies and proceedings dictated by the ultra-montane spirit which presides over the metropolitan councils, may easily be imagined. The replies of the Ruri-decanal chapters to the archbishop's pastoral on the subject of the "German Catholic" schism sufficiently indicated those feelings; and a further and stronger manifestation has since taken place, in the shape of a petition to the archbishop, which has been put into extensive circulation, to the amount of thousands of copies, and is receiving numerous signatures from both clergy and laity. The petition is as follows:—

"The present movements in the Church in Germany claim the attention of every thoughtful and well-intentioned person. They have attracted our attention, too, more particularly since we have had an opportunity of observing their phenomena in this diocese. We have had our minds directed to them by your Excellency's own pastoral on the subject, addressed to the faithful of the archdiocese of Freiburg.

"It is a fact which, however differently viewed and judged, is universally admitted, that there exists in the Catholic Church in Germany an antinational party, that this party is daily increasing in number and extent, that it displays daily greater boldness and power in the pursuit of its aim, and that the disastrous consequences of its tendencies have already variously taken effect throughout Germany, and in particular in our grand duchy of Baden. What this party aims at, and what its tendencies will lead to, cannot be doubtful to any one who has attentively observed it and its movements, and is familiar with the history of the last three centuries. It is with deep pain that those who love our German fatherland witness the rekindling of the ancient ruinous Church feud, which provoked the Thirty Years' War, and inflicted on our common country wounds which to this hour are not yet healed. The fact is, that the party in question professes antinational principles, that is to say, principles not only incompatible with, but directly hostile to the social condition and wants of the German people, as well as to the fundamental laws of the political state of Germany, whether general or local, of older or of more recent date. No less antinational are its tendencies; they are opposed to the legally established order of things in Germany, they violate and destroy the rights of the temporal power of the State in its relation to the Church, and the rights and the existence of other recognized communions in their relation to the Catholic communion. Again, no less antinational is its aim; this is no other than to bring back in Germany the mediæval condition of the Church, in manifest contradiction, not only to the rights of the

nation and of the government, but to the whole character of modern civilization. The inevitable consequence of all which is, the disturbance and ultimate destruction of religious peace, both private and public, in our German fatherland,—a consequence which is already heavily felt, to the great grief of all good men.

"Another fact which, however differently viewed and judged, is no less universally admitted, is that a schism has actually taken place in the Catholic Church, and has, we can only lament it, produced a formal separation which threatens to become more and more extensive. Into an examination of the character of this separation we do not wish here to enter. An attentive and impartial observer cannot, however, help perceiving what, indeed, the very name of 'German Catholics,' assumed by the separatists, indicates, that the above-named antinational party is in a very great measure to blame for this separation; and that the schism and separation increases in proportion as that party gains greater ascendancy in the Catholic Church; for besides the separatists, there are opposed to that party all those Catholics who profess the ecclesiastical principles of the Emperor Joseph II., whose premature death is much to be deplored; principles which guided the universally revered Baron Von Wessenberg, in his well-known and highly honoured episcopal administration down to the dissolution of the diocese of Constance, and the excellency of which has been proved by the fruits which they have already borne, in the mutual toleration of the different communions, in the peaceable and friendly intercourse of the members of the different Churches, in the accordance of the position of the Church with the laws of the State, in many essential improvements of the internal condition of the Catholic Church, and more particularly of clerical education, and, generally speaking, in the visible progress of the popular mind under the influence of a spirit of true Christian love.

"To this class of Catholics it is well known that the majority of the faithful in the archdiocese of Freiburg belong. Our determined opposition to the antinational party in our Church, and our profound regret at the separation which has taken place, arise entirely from our sincere devotion to the country to which we belong, and to the Church whose members we profess to be. The welfare of both is alike dear to our hearts; and we wish for nothing more anxiously, than that both may be preserved from the injuries with which they are threatened by the present movements in the Catholic Church. From the warm interest which we thus take in our fatherland and our Church, springs likewise our present humble request to your Excellency, that you may be pleased to convoke a diocesan synod. In making this request, we have recourse to that remedy which the Church has ever applied, in circumstances of peculiar consequence or danger, and generally upon all important occasions, and which, in the present excited state of the Church, can alone bring about those results which the country and the Church at this time require, and which have been already suggested to your Excellency, in accordance with public opinion, by several ruri-decanal chapters.

"All our hopes for the country's and the Church's weal in the present state of affairs rest solely on the convocation of a diocesan synod, composed, according to the ancient and primitive constitution of the Christian Church, of both clerical and lay members. From the very first the Catholic Church has set a high value on synodical assemblies, and assigned to them the first and highest rank in the ecclesiastical constitution. Not only has she convoked synods on extraordinary emergencies like the present, but she has made the regular and periodical convocation both of general and of provincial and diocesan synods a matter of universal obligation. She has even threatened the rulers of the Church with severe punishments, for instance, with sequestration, and even with deprivation, in the event of their neglecting, or still more their refusing, to convoke them. Deeply sensible of the high value and the absolute necessity of synods, the Church has provided by particular and universally valid enactments for the convocation and the holding of synods, even in case the bishop to whom immediately it belongs to convoke them, should fail to do so.

"If these enactments are applicable to the convocation of settled and periodically repeated synods of the Church, how much more applicable are they to the convocation of extraordinary synods, rendered indispensably necessary by events so pregnant with consequences and so full of danger to the country and the Church, as those which present themselves at the present juncture. Considering how manifestly necessary an ecclesiastical synod is at this moment, so much so, that the peace of the country and the Church which is evidently endangered, can be maintained by no other means; considering that the great majority of the faithful of the diocese are, as unquestionably they are at this present time, sensible of this necessity; considering moreover that the convocation of such a synod is a measure which the law of the Church gives them a perfect right to demand, and which has for its object simply the maintenance and security of order and peace in Church and State, it is not to be imagined that the authorities either of Church or State would wish or venture to refuse their co-operation. Our view is more immediately directed upon the significant indications in the aspect of the Church in our grand duchy of Baden, and upon the threatening consequences likely to ensue; and we are desirous of meeting the emergency in good earnest, in the first place in our own country, by the most appropriate means, a diocesan synod, which according to ecclesiastical law has full power to apply a remedy. Our example will, without fail, be followed in other dioceses; and the diocesan synods will thus pave the way for the final settlement, in a national synod, of a question which has long been, and has recently again become, a matter of the utmost importance to Germany. Upon these grounds we prefer to our Most Reverend Archbishop the humble request, that your Excellency may be pleased, in consideration of the urgency of the case, to convoke a diocesan synod with as little delay as possible."

Neo-Catholicism.—The hollow and unsound character of this movement becomes more and more apparent. The published reports of the

"Synods," held during the course of last autumn, contain the most melancholy evidence of the absence of all fixed principles, both of doctrine and of Church constitution. At the Breslau "Synod," held in the middle of August, one speaker, after premising that he himself had these forty years been quite clear (*i. e.* quite an unbeliever) on the subject, suggested that, in tenderness to popular prejudice, the words "the Son of God," should be re-inserted in the creed; he was told that such a course would defeat the object he had in view, the Leipzig confession, to which it was determined to adhere, being expressly so framed that both the assertors and the deniers of the divinity of Christ should be comprehended. With regard to their ministers, it was settled that they should not be considered as a distinct order, but should in all respects, except their appointment to preside over the worship of the congregation, be viewed in the same light as laymen; they should be called preachers, not pastors; a suggestion to connect cure of souls with their office, was universally scouted. It was also determined that all members of a certain age, not dependent by relationship on other members of the congregation, as, for instance, widows, single women, and women married to husbands not belonging to the German Catholic body, should enjoy all the privileges of membership, and have votes on all matters of faith and discipline. At the "synod," of Marienwerder, held immediately after the Breslau meeting, the principal topic of discussion was the absence of Czerski, who had given a distinct promise to appear and give explanations respecting his letters and manifestoes on behalf of orthodoxy. The culprit not making his appearance, his conduct was freely canvassed in his absence, and a reprimand, with an exhortation to more peaceable conduct for the future, was forwarded to him from the assembly. The "synod" at Stuttgardt, in the middle of September, was remarkable chiefly for its conviviality, and produced more toasts than resolutions. The Berlin "synod," held in the latter part of October, was opened by Brauner, the preacher of the Berlin congregation, with a speech in which he reminded the assembled representatives of the Neo-Catholic Churches, that in opposition to the antiquated dogmas of all existing communions, they looked to "that Eternal Spirit who reveals himself to man through the light of his reason." In the discussion on the days of religious observance, Ascension-day was strongly objected to as being calculated to induce misconceptions; viz., the belief in the personal ascension of Christ, and his personal reign in glory; the question of the days to be observed was, in the end, left an open question, so that each congregation might suit its own taste. Lastly, it was determined, touching the position of the "preachers," that they are liable to be suspended and dismissed by their congregations. The foregoing are the most important results of these four "Synods;" the history of the different sections into which the original schism has split, is not worth recording; mutual animosities and jealousies, accusations and recriminations of congregations and sections of congregations, as well as of individuals against each other, are becoming more frequent aud more disgusting.

ITALY.—*Consistorial Appointments.*—During the year 1845, the pope has appointed three patriarchs, one for Lisbon, the other two schismatical, *i. e.* for Antioch and Constantinople, "*in partibus infidelium;*"—two metropolitans, one for Gnesen and Posen (Mgr. Léon de Przyluscki), the other for Lima, in South America;—twelve archbishops, one for Camerino, in the Pontifical States; three for Naples, Syracuse, and Monreale, in the kingdom of the two Sicilies; one for Lucca; one for Evora, in Portugal; one for Colocza and Bachia, in Hungary; and five more "*in partibus infidelium;*"—and thirty-three bishops, viz., for the Pontifical States 7; the kingdom of Naples 10; Sardinia 2; France 3; Hungary 2; Bohemia 1; Prussia, the sees of Breslau (Dr. Diepenbrock), and Paderborn (Dr. Drepper), 2; Cape Verd, in Africa, 1; and "*in partibus infidelium*" 5. Four cardinal priests and two cardinal deacons were created, and the pall was conferred upon one patriarch, one metropolitan, and eight archbishops.

Saint and Relic Worship.—Six cases of aspirants (a term incongruous enough when applied to dead men and women) to a place in the Romish calendar, have been brought before the congregation of rites during the year 1845, and more or less advanced. Among the names are those of the famous mendicant Bénoit-Joseph Labre, and of the infamous Margaret Mary Alacoque, the confederate of the Jesuit Colombière in setting on foot the superstition blasphemously entitled, "The Worship of the Sacred Heart of Jesus." Collections to defray the cost of the proceedings in the former case have been ordered by the bishops of several dioceses in France; and for the promotion of the latter, special prayers have been offered, and *neuvaines* held, in the nunneries of the order of the Visitation. In the circular of the Bishop of Marseilles, ordering collections on three consecutive Sundays in all the churches of his diocese, in aid of the beatification of Labre, the following passage occurs, which throws considerable light upon the practical use of these proceedings in the Romish chancery:—"By a decree of the year 1842, His Holiness Gregory XVI., gloriously reigning, has declared that the virtues of that venerable servant of God, Bénoit-Joseph Labre had risen to an 'heroical degree.' Nothing therefore remains, but to proceed legally to the recognition of the miracles attributed to his intercession; but the forms required for this purpose are extremely severe, in the investigation of the truth and of the nature of the facts. They are exceedingly lengthy and multifarious. The grave nature of the consequences to be deduced from them imperatively demands their employment, as indispensable safeguards for ascertaining, so as not to leave any room for doubt, the circumstances brought under the strict investigation of the sacred congregation of rites. These forms take place by way of contest between two parties charged with the maintenance of opposite theses. They are accomplished by protracted debates, and by the printing and publication of a great mass of documentary evidence, attested by all the characteristics of truth and authenticity. Besides, a great number of memoirs and other writings of the theologians and consultors of the congregation of rites are printed and

published, which memoirs and writings are exceedingly voluminous, the questions contained in them being minutely discussed, examined under every aspect, and sifted to the very last depth. In short, the holy see never pronounces till the most complete and incontrovertible certainty has been attained by human means, independently of the supernatural assistance which it obtains from on high. Now, rev. sir, in order to arrive at this result, *considerable expenditure is necessary. The funds destined to defray the costs of the cause of the venerable Bénoit-Joseph Labre are by this time exhausted, and I have been requested by the postulator in this cause, and by a consultor of the sacred congregation of rites, in the name of His Excellency the Cardinal Vicar of His Holiness, to make an appeal to the generosity of the faithful of my diocese, that they may contribute by their alms to the continuance of a proceeding* so truly interesting to France(!), the country which has given to the Church THE HOLY PERSONAGE WHOM IT IS INTENDED TO PLACE UPON THE ALTARS"(!!)

The relics of another recently canonized saint, St. Alphonso de Liguori[9], were carried in procession through the streets of Naples in April last, enclosed, according to the practice now adopted in Italy, in a wax figure, representing the saint, and dressed up in gorgeous pontifical array. The royal family, the civil and military authorities, and an immense concourse of people, attended the ceremony.

Centenary of the Council of Trent.—The third centenary of the Tridentine Council was celebrated with great pomp in the city of Trent, on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of December last. The prince bishop caused on this occasion the side chapel of his cathedral to be restored, before the crucifix of which the acts of the Council were signed; and the municipality caused a lofty marble column with the statue of the virgin, the "*exterminatrix* of heresies," to be erected in front of the church of Sta. Maria Maggiore, in which the Council held its sittings. The celebration itself was a singular mixture of religious solemnities, for which a number of "Princes of the Church," cardinals, bishops, and abbots, had assembled; and of worldly amusements, such as concerts, fireworks, fire-balloons, discharges of artillery, illuminations, and the like.

NEWFOUNDLAND.—*Local Support of the Church.*—A plan has been devised by the Bishop, in conjunction with the Church Society, which has for its object the collection of Church money from all the members, at the rate of one penny a head per week, for the support of the clergy and schoolmasters, so as to relieve the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel,* by whose exertions chiefly the Church has been planted in Newfoundland, from this burden, within, it is hoped, the space of a few years. It is calculated that the annual revenue of the Church Society raised by this means, when the plan shall have been brought into full operation, will not only be sufficient for the maintenance of the clergy now employed in the diocese, but will admit of an addition of seventeen

[9] One of the five saints canonized on Trinity Sunday 1839, of whose lives an English edition was prepared under the auspices of Dr. Wiseman.

to their number. The working of the plan has been committed by the Bishop to the clergy themselves, to whom he has addressed a circular on the subject, directing them how to proceed, and exhorting them to enforce on their flocks the *positive Christian duty*, according to the rule of the Gospel, to provide for the maintenance of the Christian ministry. All the monies so collected are to be remitted to the central fund, from which the stipends of the clergy, equalized throughout the diocese, will be paid; the only room left for inequality in the incomes of different clergy, being those arising from the enjoyment of parsonages and glebes, and the varying amount of surplice fees. This contribution, the failure of which in some few instances will, it is hoped, be more than compensated by the excess of the more liberal contributions of the wealthier Church members, will include all and every demand made upon the people on account of the Church or of public education, saving only that the repair of the buildings, and the current expenses for the performance of Divine worship, will have to be met by local collection or assessment.

"I have now only to entreat you," the Bishop adds, at the conclusion of his circular, "for Christ's and the Church's sake, to use your endeavours, with prayers for God's help and blessing, to render this plan as general and effective as possible. You cannot feel more strongly than I do, that a very laborious and irksome service will be superadded to duties already sufficiently onerous and ill requited; but if it be, as indeed it is, for the honour of God and his Church, and the maintenance of Scriptural truth and Apostolic order in this country, I confidently expect you will not shrink from performing or attempting it. Gratitude indeed to that noble society—which, when we devoted ourselves to the service of God in this ministry, came forward to supply us with things necessary and convenient for this present life, and has encouraged and supported us in all our trials and privations—gratitude for such benefits will constrain us to be diligent and self-denying in this emergency. As far as possible, I am prepared to share with you all the unpopularity or other pain which may at first attach to this new and unexpected demand; and as you will ground your application upon the sacred principle of *your duty* both to God and his people, so you will warn and admonish your flocks that it is *their duty* cheerfully to allow the application and answer your call; and that for the neglect of this duty, as surely as of any other, they will bring on themselves Divine displeasure, with all its inevitable consequences; while, on the other hand, God Himself has said by his prophet, "Prove me now herewith (i. e. with tithes and offerings), if I will not open you the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it."

Tunis.—*Abolition of Slavery.*—While slave-dealing in its most offensive form is carried on under the eyes of the French and "catholic" conquerors of Algeria, and while in America Christian sectarians are advocating the consistency of slave-holding with the profession of

Christianity, the Mahommedan Bey of Tunis has abolished slavery within his regency. The following is the letter by which the Bey notifies this act of his government to the foreign consuls:—

"Praise be to God! The Muschir Ahmet-Pacha-Bey, Prince of the regency of Tunis, to our ally N. N., consul-general of N. N., resident at Tunis.

"The object of this letter is to let you know, that that kind of property consisting of human beings, towards whom God (be He praised for it!) has been so generous, is most unjust, and absolutely repugnant to our feelings. This matter has occupied us all the years during which, as you are aware, we have been endeavouring to put an end to it.

"We are happy to be able now to declare to you, that we abolish in all our dominions this property in slaves. Henceforth every slave in our regency is to be considered free, and verily we shall no longer consider him as property.

"We have given notice of this to all the governors of our regency of Tunis. We hereby give you notice also, that whatever slave shall enter our dominions, by land or by sea, will immediately be declared free.

"The protection of God be ever upon you!

"Given at Moharrem, January, 1262."

It is gratifying to know that the execution of this decree, which took effect immediately, was not attended by any kind of disturbance. By far the largest number of slaves determined on remaining with their Arab masters (who, indeed, generally treat their slaves kindly) in the capacity of hired servants. The French Society for the Abolition of Slavery has decreed a medal to the Bey. "This," as the *Espérance* observes, "is well done; but something more remains to be done."

Turkey.—*The Patriarchate of Constantinople.* The patriarch of Constantinople, Meletius, died lately, at the age of 70, after a short illness. He had occupied the patriarchal see only seven months. The Bishop of Ephesus has been elected to succeed him. At his death no less than five of his predecessors, summarily deprived, according to Turkish practice, were living; viz. 1. Constantine, formerly Bishop of Sinai, who occupied the see upwards of four years, and was banished to the isle of Antigone; 2. Constantine, surnamed, by way of distinction from the former, the Ignorant, banished, within less than a year after his elevation, to Arnautkeuï, a village on the Bosporus; 3. Gregory, formerly Bishop of Serres, in Macedonia, banished after three or four years' occupation of the see to the same place as his predecessor; 4. Anthimos, formerly Bishop of Nicomedia, banished after a short tenure to the Princes' Islands, at the entrance of the Bosporus. Between him and Gregory, another Anthimos, formerly Bishop of Cyzicum, intervened, who died in possession of the patriarchate; 5. Germanos, who also did not occupy the see more than three years.

THE

ENGLISH REVIEW.

JUNE, 1846.

ART. I.—1. *The Life of Bishop Wilson. By the Rev.* C. CRUTTWELL. *Works of the Right Rev. T. Wilson, Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man.* In 8 vols. Vol. i.

2. *Œuvres de St. François de Sales, Evèque, Prince de Genève.* 4 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1839.

3. *The Life of St. Francis de Sales, Bishop and Prince of Geneva. Written in French by* MONS. DE MARSOLLIER. *Done into English by* W. C—. London, 1738.

4. *Mémoires du Duc de St. Simon sur le Siècle de Louis XIV. et la Régence.* Tome xxvii. Paris, 1840.

WHATEVER may be the inconveniences which have of late years arisen from the public and warm discussions of subjects relating to the Church, too important for the columns of a newspaper, and too profound for the comprehension of the majority of even well educated men,—one consequence of this collision of opinions and these tumultuous discussions may be valuable and produce excellent effects. It is this: people have begun to feel that there is something very unsatisfactory in the grounds and reasons advanced by the organs and champions of public opinion on both sides, in almost every instance in which matters of ecclesiastical polity have been discussed. They have begun to suspect that these matters are not quite so easy and obvious as they had been used to believe,—that what is called common sense affords no solution of their difficulties, and that many things which have passed for principles are little more than received common-places quite inapplicable to practical purposes. Those who are not mere declaimers and party men, or shallow thinkers, have perceived more or less clearly that there is somewhere an unexplored or imperfectly known region where certain truths are treasured up, the fundamental principles whereon the whole machine and economy of Church government are grounded; and that those principles are required to infuse life into our ecclesiastical constitution, as well as to settle the doubts and disputes

which circumstances or human perversity from time to time create.

Let us suppose a great empire in which there is indeed a regularly constituted administration, with a multitude of offices subservient in various departments to the public welfare, but wherein no one cares to investigate the spirit of those institutions, their relation to each other and to the Commonwealth, and the benefits which ought to accrue from each, and from the combination of all for the happiness and honour of the body politic. What would be the consequence of such a state of things? Such a government would be like a man possessing a precious scientific instrument but wanting the knowledge to use it, otherwise than by a species of imitation and the force of mere mechanical habit. Some advantage he may derive from it, but its more recondite and important uses are utterly lost to him. He can do nothing beyond his usual practice. If he is required to deal with any uncommon difficulty, he stands amazed and embarrassed. Such a government as we have supposed must moreover be liable to decay. Many things therein will become obsolete and suffer a change, because no one knows what they really are, and what they ought to be. The system may go on quietly and apparently well in good times, but let a difficulty arise, and confusion must ensue. Then the want of some things will begin to be perceived which had been forgotten and despised. But ruined institutions are not so easily restored as ruined buildings. They cannot be recalled into existence full of life and vigour, at the very time when they are wanted. The process of revival requires time. Principles must be drawn out of obscurity, prejudices and habits must be overcome, and a new system must be understood and acted upon.

So we see in the Church of England, that difficulties and dangers arising out of altered circumstances have shown the imperfect state of the internal economy of that Church, and the want not of institutions themselves, but of fundamental principles which are the life of institutions. Thus, in several instances where churchmen thought that they were debating matters of discipline and practice, they have in reality been at cross purposes with each other about first principles. If this had not been so, we should not have heard so much strife about matters in themselves unimportant, and which have no value beyond their connexion with fundamental principles. We should not have seen these things made matter of obstinate and violent contention, apparently for their own sakes, while the disputants on both sides felt a secret consciousness more or less distinct that the real merits of the question were out of sight.

Reflecting carefully and somewhat painfully on these things, we have been strongly impressed with the feeling that the *constitutional law of the Church* has become almost unknown among us, and that it is very necessary, and ought to be revived, especially in the present time. The Church of England is indeed very much in the condition of the supposed commonwealth described above. It has a variety of institutions, and a great apparatus of offices and dignities, but no one cares to study their spirit and uses except for the most obvious and strictly necessary purposes,—for the purposes of mere administration and government. The arcana of ecclesiastical public law are neglected and unknown. Churchmen are satisfied with the *status quo* and the mere rudiments, the bare essentials, the mere daily bread of Church government. And yet what system of polity requires and deserves more profound meditation? Its objects extend beyond the existence of the world. How is the law of the Church defined? *Est jus canonicum quod civium actiones ad finem æternæ beatitudinis dirigit.* That grand purpose is the end to which the whole economy of the polity of the Church is directed, as the visible and practical means of accomplishing the purpose for which the Church was instituted by the Divine will. These principles are essential to the very notion and purpose of a Church visible, which is a community or corporate society having a certain commission, and founded for the fulfilment of a purpose by means defined by Divine authority[1].

A great canonist says:—

"Ecclesiam visibilem esse societatem, et ideo visibili regendam esse gubernatione, sine qua nulla hominum societas diu stare et conservari potest, superiori loco demonstratum est. . . . Christus ecclesiam constituit ad instar reipublicæ a civile distinctæ, eique dedit magistratus, qui huic hominum societati cum imperio præessent. Quare in hos magistratus omnem contulit potestatem, qua opus est ut recte administretur regaturque respublica atque ut optimis abundet legibus, quibus cuncti pareant, ut repugnantes etiam in officio pœnis coerceantur. Nam quomodo stabit respublica sine magistratibus aut cum magistratibus otiosis et inanibus qui jurisdictione imperioque careant[2]."

The office of the spiritual magistrate is an essential part of the constitution of the visible Church, which must have a visible government. It follows thence that the institution and nature of that office in all its parts must be the object of most studious investigation and profound meditation to all those who have any concern in ecclesiastical affairs. Unless this be so,—unless the

[1] Palmer, Treat. on the Church, part i. ch. iii. per tot.
[2] Devoti Inst. Canon. tom. ii. p. 4.

very spirit of the visible government of the Church be thoroughly understood,—and every object for which each portion of the office of the spiritual magistrate is intended be realized,—there is manifest danger that that spirit and those objects will in some particular become forgotten, and that the machine of the Church's constitution will be more or less paralysed.

A churchman who contemplates being invested with ecclesiastical jurisdiction or authority, ought by study and meditation to form in his own mind, an abstract notion—an ideal perfection of every office and every function in the hierarchy of the Church's constitution, and of the way in which each contributes to the great purpose for which the Church is founded. He ought to carry his idea of that perfection even beyond the limits of human possibility. Like the great Roman orator, he ought to conceive something which perhaps never existed!

"Atque ego in summo oratore fingendo talem informabo qualis fortassis nemo fuit. Non enim quæro quis fuerit, sed quid sit illud quo nihil possit esse præstantius; quod in perpetuitate dicendi non sæpe atque haud scio an unquam in aliqua autem parte eluceat aliquando, item apud alios otiosius, apud alios fortasse rarius. Sed ego sic statuo nihil esse in ullo genere tam pulcrum quo non pulcrius id sit unde illud ut ex ore aliquo quasi imago exprimatur, quod neque oculis neque auribus neque ullo sensu percipi potest; cogitatione tantum et mente complectimur. Itaque et Phidiæ simulacris, quibus nihil in illo genere perfectius vidimus his picturis quas nominavi, cogitare tamen possumus pulcriora. Nec vero ille artifex cum faceret Jovis formam aut Minervæ contemplabatur aliquem e quo similitudinem duceret; sed ipsius in mente insidebat species pulcritudinis eximia quædam, quam intuens, in eaque defixus, ad illius similitudinem artem et manum dirigebat[3]."

So the contemplation of the office of the spiritual magistrate, ought to produce a conception of a degree of perfection, *quo nihil potest esse præstantius*,—and that abstract image of perfection should become the standard of the true nature and scope of that office. How much more this should be so in the administration of the Church than in the cultivation of art! If Phidias could not form a master-piece of art without previously conceiving a supreme beauty beyond the reach of his skill to represent,—can the spiritual functions of ecclesiastical power and jurisdiction be realized and worthily exercised, unless by the conception of a degree of perfection most absolutely excellent and transcendent? And when we speak of perfection, we do not refer only to the qualities of the person, but we also include the perfection of the office itself in all its parts,—its adaptation to every purpose for

[3] Cicero, Orator, § 2.

which it was instituted, and to the furtherance of the great scheme, for the accomplishment of which the Church was founded. We mean not only the sanctity and greatness of the person, but also the excellence of the office in all the fulness of its spirit.

The churchman is, moreover, powerfully supported in his endeavours to appreciate and realize in his own mind the ideal perfection of the spiritual and ecclesiastical commission. He is not left to rely on his own genius and imagination. However great they may be, they must fall short of the vastness, the comprehensiveness, and the exquisite completeness of the sacred commonwealth. But in the principles of the ecclesiastical public law he will find a prototype—*species pulcritudinis eximia*—surpassing all that man can attain without Divine assistance. Such is the nature and genius of the Christian religion, whereof the public law of the Church is the practical application.

These reflections will perhaps seem overstrained, and wanting in practical sense. It is indeed the spirit of this time and country, to look on every thing in a somewhat confined way, with reference not to principles of truth determined, *à priori*, but to some present object or convenience—often temporary—but always suggested by present circumstances. This may be well in finance and commerce, and sometimes even in politics,—but it is utterly inapplicable to the government of the Church. We will therefore pursue our course, disregarding these objections.

It is manifestly impossible here to give even a sketch of the application of these principles to the whole system of the Church's polity; or indeed to do more than touch upon a few points which especially require our attention, having regard to the present position of the Anglican Church. We refer particularly to certain matters relating to the episcopal office. We have already said that the contemplation and study of the nature and all the attributes of the office of the spiritual magistrate, are of the utmost importance to the churchman, and that he ought to form in his mind a conception of the ideal perfection of every office in the hierarchy of the visible Church. But he ought especially to study and meditate upon the episcopal office, for it is the plenitude of the sacerdotal character and commission, the supreme depository of spiritual jurisdiction,—the very corner-stone of the Church visible on earth. If that office is not understood in its real spirit, if any part of its functions is allowed to fall into neglect, the whole commonwealth of the Church must suffer detriment. It must be realized in the most absolute and transcendent perfection. It must not be brought down to the standard of practice and customs in our times, nor adapted to the mediocrity of the world, and the

demands of what is called society. It must stand alone as an institution belonging to no time, to no country, and to no portion of society, immutable, conceding nothing except for charity's sake, and displaying all the functions of the vicar of Christ on earth.

The subject is vast,—but we will confine ourselves for the present to the pastoral functions of the bishop, endeavouring to describe that portion of those functions which seems to be imperfectly understood in this country, if not almost obsolete. Many of the greatest divines of the Church of England have lamented the dormant state of the ecclesiastical discipline which consists in the moral government of the people,—the want of some means to influence the mass of the population, beyond the routine of parochial preaching and teaching. The jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts is manifestly inadequate for so great a purpose. The penitential character of that jurisdiction is quite extinct, and it is almost entirely secular in its spirit and unedifying in its operation. Yet the exercise of spiritual censures is in practice confined to those courts. We may assume then, without any undutifulness or irreverence towards the bishops, that there is some defect,—something wanting in our ecclesiastical administration.

In truth, instead of the Church keeping a control over society, —society has influenced the Church. The Church has adapted itself in its practice to the temper and spirit of the times. The spirit of society is above all things independence. It will not be interfered with. It will not submit to hear any thing displeasing except with its own consent. A man who goes to church must hear what the parson says to him though it be disagreeable, but if he is displeased he stays away,—and then he will brook no interference except from the civil magistrate. So long as he does not offend against the law of the land, or rather, so long as he is not detected in any offence against the law, he claims absolute sovereign supremacy on earth, and boasts that he is accountable to no one but God and his own conscience. But he says with Tartuffe, "Il y a avec le Ciel des accommodements." His sense of responsibility to God is somewhat vague, and as for his conscience, he scorns the idea that any man can exercise jurisdiction over it, but he administers absolution to himself. The tribunal of public opinion requires certain outward observances, and from time to time makes an example of some offender, who has had the imprudence or the misfortune to be detected; but it has too great a regard for talent, riches, or success, to be very hard on one who possesses any of those titles to indulgence. Besides, how can commerce, manufactures, and the railroad

system flourish,—how can the prosperity of the country increase, if people are so scrupulous as to the means of making money and promoting great public undertakings? With all these things, therefore, the Church ought not to interfere!

The Church has given way to this spirit of the times. It has reluctantly indulged the pride and independence of the people, by submitting to abstain from interfering with them unless and so far as they voluntarily put themselves in the way of, and invite its interference. There is a sort of prudence in this adaptation of the Church's discipline to the state of society and the genius of the age, but at the same time it abandons the *species pulcritudinis eximia*, the abstract and transcendent perfection of the Church's office.

The consequence of this departure from ideal and abstract perfection is, that the episcopal office—the fountain of jurisdiction and discipline—has suffered a diminution of its functions. Its standard is no longer that perfection springing from the rules of ecclesiastical public law, but a sort of convenience and adaptation to the present state of society and the habits of our times, and thus its functions are narrowed, and its vigour and life much impaired. But all this will more clearly appear when we have carried our disquisitions further.

Let us look, in the first place, at the constitution of episcopacy as it existed in the Church of the first centuries, according to the testimony of the fathers and of all the canonists. It was always the general doctrine of the Church that bishops were successors of the Apostles, and therefore supreme in the Church[4]. And the episcopal office is, and always has been, identical in kind if not in largeness with that of the Apostles[5]. In accordance with these undoubted principles, as ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction were primarily given by Christ to the Apostles, so the bishop, the successor of the Apostles, and possessing the plenitude and perfection of the priesthood, was the immediate pastor and governor of the whole Church submitted to his care. He did nothing without the consent of his clergy, who assisted him in his duties, but still he was the supreme priest as well as the bishop of the whole diocese. He had in practice as well as in principle *the cure of souls of the whole diocese*. Thus the 28th apostolic canon describes the bishop as him, *cujus fidei populus est creditus et a quo pro animabus ratio exigetur*, and the 24th canon of the Council of Antioch, desires all things appertaining to the

[4] Palmer, Treat. of the Church, vol. ii. part vi. ch. i. p. 337.
[5] Hooker, Eccles. Polit. b. vii. § iv. in fin. Hericourt, LL. Eccles. p. 185.

Church to be in the power of the bishop: *cui est omnis populus creditus, et eorum animæ, quæ in ecclesiam conveniunt*[6].

This is strictly in accordance with the words and spirit of holy writ. What was the commission under which the Apostles derived their spiritual powers? *Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c.;* and again, *Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted, &c.* Under this commission their successors must exercise the episcopal functions, for they have no other commission. That commission is manifestly pastoral and sacerdotal, not confined to superintendence and the administration of the rites of ordination and confirmation, but embracing the pastoral functions of the priesthood, preaching and teaching, and the administration of the sacraments. And this is further shown by the directions given to Timothy and Titus, and by the constant practice of the Apostles.

In the process of time, when Christianity was extended throughout a large population, spread over great tracts of country, it became impossible for the bishop to exercise the same personal care of souls at all times over his entire flock. It consequently became necessary that a portion of those functions should be entrusted to his clergy, and smaller districts were therefore parceled out, over which an ecclesiastic was placed as ordinary pastor. But did this work any change in the office of the bishop? undoubtedly not. It left the apostolic office precisely what it was before. Let us see the words of the great canonist Van Espen.

"At hæc inferiorum ministrorum cura ac sollicitudo nequaquam episcopum a totius diœcesis cura eximit. Ille namque est et manet totius diœcesis caput et principalis minister, cui omnes inferiores adjutores et administri accedunt, cum quadam ad ipsum episcopum in his quæ ecclesiæ regimen et functiones hierarchicas spectant dependentia et subjectione[7]."

The bishop still remains the supreme pastor, and teacher, and priest, with cure of souls of the whole diocese. He is relieved by the assistance of his clergy from those functions which he cannot possibly perform, but his duty and responsibility remain precisely what they were in the first years of the Church. Above all, his duty of preaching and teaching remains, which is an essential part of the sacerdotal office, and indeed no one can preach but by the bishop's authority.

It is necessary here to observe, that this apostolical function of

[6] Van Espen, Jus Eccles. Univ. tom. i. p. 294.
[7] Van Espen, tom. i. p. 295. Tit. De Cura Episcopali, cap. vii. § iii.

teaching is not to be exercised by mere instruction. It is teaching with authority as a superior, having spiritual jurisdiction. It extends not merely to the imparting of knowledge and to persuasion, but also to censure and positive injunction. It is a means not only of instruction but of discipline. This ought to be kept in mind.

One effect of the extension of the Church over great districts beyond the local sphere of the bishop's constant and immediate care, was to render his visitations more and more important and necessary. In the life of St. Paul we find many instances of episcopal visitations[8], and they were continued from the apostolic times. In the first age, when the people constituted one flock, subject to the bishop and presbytery of the city as their immediate pastors, visitations were within a small compass, and from house to house. But as the Church extended, visitations extended also, and thus Bingham refers to the obligation of the bishop to *visit his diocese* as a proof of the antiquity of parish churches:—

"For this is a necessary consequent of having several churches at a distance under his jurisdiction, such as he could not personally attend himself, he was obliged to visit and see that they were provided with a proper incumbent, and that every thing was performed in due order. St. Austin and St. Basil, who had pretty large dioceses, speak often upon this account of their being employed in their visitations. And the rule in some places was to visit, ordinarily, once a year, as appears, from the council of Terraco in Spain, which lays this injunction on bishops, because it was found by experience that many churches in their dioceses were left destitute and neglected, therefore they were obliged to visit them once a year. And if a diocese was so large that a bishop could not perform this duty annually, that was thought a reasonable cause to divide the diocese, and lay some part of the burthen on a new bishop; which was the reason assigned in the council of Lugo for dividing the large diocese of Gallicia[9]."

Visitations thus became a necessary means for the exercise of the bishop's pastoral functions as the successor of the Apostles, having the cure of souls of the whole diocese, and the sole ordinary judge of all spiritual affairs arising therein. In his visitations especially, the bishop exercised his pastoral function of teaching his people, and all his apostolical authority. It may, indeed, be called the chief point of his pastoral office. To show what is the extent and importance of this duty, we beg permission to cite a canon, which may perhaps at first sight be liable to objection, but we cite it only as a declaration touching a matter of undisputed discipline, made by a synod of upwards of 300 bishops, and

[8] Acts xiv. 23. 26. 28; xv. 36. 40.
[9] Bingham, b. ix. ch. vi. sec. 22.

comprising all the most learned ecclesiastics of the Roman Church. We mean the chap. 3, de Reformat. Sess. 24, of the Council of Trent, which is as follows :—

"Visitationum præcipuus sit scopus sanam orthodoxamque doctrinam, expulsis hæresibus, inducere, bonos mores tueri, pravos corrigere, populum cohortationibus et admonitionibus ad religionem, pacem, innocentiam accendere ; cetera prout locus, tempus, occasio feret, ex visitantium prudentia ad fidelium fructum constituere."

This description, which is undeniably in accordance with the practice of the Church from the apostolic times, comprises the entire matter over which the moral and religious discipline of the Church extends. It comprehends the whole moral and religious government of the clergy and people within the bishop's jurisdiction. It suggests to the mind a splendid portraiture of an apostolic prelate, the father of his people, not satisfied with the superintendence of the clergy and the administration of his Church's temporal affairs, but incessantly devoting himself to the moral and religious government of his entire flock as the supreme judge and ruler over them in all that regards their spiritual welfare. So that great canonist, Fleury, says :—

" Les fonctions de l'évêque renferment *tout l'exercice de la religion chrétienne dont il n'y a aucune partie qui ne dépende de lui.* C'est à lui à faire des Chrétiens, par la prédication et par le baptème ; à leur apprendre à prier ; à les nourrir de la parole de Dieu et des sacrements ; à faire des prêtres et des évêques, qui puissent exercer les mêmes fonctions que lui, et perpétuer la religion jusqu'à la fin des siècles[1]."

But all these things are comprehended in the character of the bishop as the successor of the apostles, and therefore, Christ's vicegerent and representative on earth.

Such are the leading principles of the ecclesiastical public law respecting the office of the bishop. It is by profound meditation on them,—by studying their real spirit drawn from holy writ,—that the ideal perfection of a bishop can be realized and portrayed in the mind of the churchman. The contemplation of that ideal perfection is essential to maintain the Divine institution of episcopacy in its full vigour and efficacy, and to protect it from the debilitating influences of the world and of human frailty. Without some standard of absolute and transcendent perfection, the episcopal office will be brought down to an inferior standard, taken from the habits of society and the mediocrity of the world, and thereby suffer diminution, to the injury of the whole system of the

[1] Fleury, Hist. du Droit Ecclés. tom. i. ch. xii. p. 122.

Church. It may still be respectable, but it will cease to be truly apostolical; and its mediocrity will necessarily affect the moral and religious condition of the whole community.

Perhaps it may be said that heroic virtues are required to enable any man to act up to the perfection of the bishop's office, that they belong to the apostolic ages, and that they are scarcely to be hoped for in modern times. But a very high degree of perfection in the functions of the office is attainable, though the person performing them has no heroic qualities. A good Christian, enlightened by the full knowledge and contemplation of his episcopal functions, and acting to the best of his power, looking up to the highest standard of the perfection of those functions, cannot fail to obtain that assistance whereby he must become an apostolic bishop. It is the knowledge of the greatness and extent of those functions,—it is the contemplation of them in their most absolute completeness and perfection that forms such a bishop, under Divine assistance.

But there have been examples of a perfection of the episcopal character in modern times equal to antiquity; and again, there have been many bishops who, though not themselves faultless, have realized the character of their office in a very splendid manner. Let us now examine, somewhat at leisure, three great prelates of modern times, who may be taken as good representatives of those two classes, namely—Francis de Sales, bishop of Geneva; Wilson, bishop of Sodor and Man; and Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray. Much valuable information may be derived from the lives of those admirable men.

Francis de Sales was a man really born for the episcopal office. He certainly did not take orders from motives of ambition. His birth was illustrious, and his position in the world was as advantageous as rank, beauty, talent, eloquence, high connexions, learning, wealth, and accomplishments could make it. These worldly advantages he sacrificed. He did not become an ecclesiastic in order to withdraw himself from trouble and the turmoil of the world, for he lived immediately after the council of Trent, when ecclesiastical affairs were most stormy and dangerous, and his life was one of constant and laborious activity. He did not take orders in disappointment at want of worldly success, for he dedicated himself to the priesthood in early youth, when all his prospects were fair and brilliant. He sought holy orders from the greatest motives alone, and for the most excellent purposes.

Such was his humility, that it was with the utmost difficulty that he was persuaded at the commencement of his career to accept the deanery of the Church of Geneva; and we find him in after life absolutely refusing a cardinal's hat, repeatedly pressed on

his acceptance by the pope and the king of France; and the coadjutorship of the Archbishop of Paris, which the Cardinal de Retz offered in the most honourable and flattering manner possible. He preferred to leave Paris, where a wide and splendid field was open to his talents, renouncing the coadjutorship with the succession to the archbishopric of that great city, and to return to his poor and troublesome diocese of Geneva. It is not surprising that with so much humility, and so little taste for high honours, he should have been unwilling to undertake the arduous charge of a bishopric. Accordingly, when the Bishop of Geneva, whose age and infirmities rendered some repose necessary, begged Francis de Sales to be his coadjutor, though he for some time refused the office, saying, "that it was a load sufficient to make an angel tremble;" and he only at last gave way to the entreaties of his parents and the bishop's injunctions, as an act of obedience to his superior. So high was his idea of what God and his Church would require of him, that his mind was harrowed with anxiety. He could take no rest, and fell into a violent fever[2]. On recovering from this sickness, he endeavoured to persuade the bishop to receive his resignation, but finding this impossible, and being convinced by the exhortations of that good prelate that he ought to submit to God's will with resignation in that particular, he betook himself with activity and vigour to the performance of his new duties, which were at that time peculiarly difficult and important, on account of the war then prevailing between King Henry IV. of France and the Duke of Savoy. A part of the diocese was invaded by the French king, and great confusion was occasioned thereby, owing to the Calvinists taking advantage of the circumstances to attack the established Church. In consequence of these events Francis was obliged to go to Paris, where his extraordinary qualities astonished the king and his court, and obtained for him a great reputation for eloquence, learning, and piety throughout that kingdom. The ability of Francis triumphed over every difficulty, and having successfully concluded his affairs, he was on his return home when he heard of the death of the venerable Bishop of Geneva[3].

Francis, who always honoured him as a father, and loved him as his benefactor, now with unfeigned tears mourned for his loss. He had not quite recovered from the terror which episcopacy had struck into him; the nearer he saw it approach, the more he was persuaded of his own unworthiness; and had it been in his power to make his predecessor immortal, he would have done it merely

[2] The Life of St. Francis de Sales, written in French by Mons. Marsollier, done into English by W. . . . C. . . . , vol. ii. p. 18.

[3] Ib. p. 94.

upon this motive, that he might not have succeeded him. But he had no choice. He must fill the vacant see, so he went with all speed to Savoy. Then, avoiding the tumultuous rejoicings of the people, he betook himself to the Castle of Sales, an ancestral seat of his house, near Annecy, his episcopal city, for the sake of enjoying as much retirement as the discharge of his duty would permit, and then preparing himself for his consecration. As soon as the unavoidable pomp and pageantry of addresses and congratulations were over, he made a retreat of twenty days, with constant prayer, meditation, and fasting, as a preparation for that holy rite; and with the assistance of a pious and learned ecclesiastic, he drew up those rules which he determined to observe during the remainder of his life. Those rules are so interesting that we will not omit them here. And first of those rules which regard the exterior[4].

"He made it a law with him never to wear silk, nor any thing else that conveyed too great lustre, as camblets or the like stuff, but always to be clothed in woollen, and that no finer than what he wore before he was a bishop; the magnificence of dress not being in his opinion the true mark of distinction between a prelate and other priests. He resolved never to appear in churches nor in public without the *rochet* and *camail*, and to wear them in his own house likewise as much as he could; this habit being, as it were, a continual remembrance of the decency, modesty, and reserve a bishop ought to show as well at home as abroad. And here we may take notice of that other rule that he prescribed to himself,—never to speak without somebody being present with persons of the other sex.

"His palace was to be neat, but plain, without paintings, or any pictures but those of devotion, and those not many, nor above the common price. He banished all magnificent furniture, and would hardly suffer two rooms to be hung, the one for strangers, and the other for receiving visits.

"He allowed himself neither coach, nor chaise, nor litter; resolving always to walk on foot, even when he visited his diocese, though the ways were never so bad, unless the badness of the weather obliged him to take horse.

"His family consisted of two priests, the one to be his chaplain, and to attend him wherever he went; the other to take care of the temporalities, and to have an eye to the behaviour of the servants. To this he added two valet-de-chambres, one to wait on strangers, and the other on himself; one only footman, and two men servants for the kitchen. They were forbidden to wear swords, or any other clothes than a dark grey. They were all to be regular, serious, and of an edifying behaviour, and frequently to go to the sacraments. No sort of

[4] Ib. p. 96.

gaming was allowed them, but care was taken that they should be constantly so profitably employed as to leave no time to be thrown away in gaming.

"They were strictly commanded to pay great respect to all ecclesiastics, and to priests especially, and himself was to give them an example. His palace was always open to them, and such priests as came from abroad, and had not houses in town, were forbid to lodge any where else but in the episcopal palace.

"It is easy to believe that 1000 crowns per annum, or thereabouts, which was then the revenue of the bishopric of Geneva, would not allow him any great expense, but besides that it is perhaps the cheapest country in the world, as he was the eldest of his family, and the Count de Sales his father would never allow him to give up his right, he had wherewithal to make a greater figure, had not his modesty and love for the poor determined him to the contrary.

"As to the treatment of his own person, and the regulation of his table, he judged it his duty exactly to observe the orders of former councils touching the temperance and frugality of bishops. He suffered nothing but common meats to be served to his table, unless some persons of distinction happened to dine with him; for it was a rule with him never to appear singular, but even then, affectation apart, he only admitted some of the most common dishes; and as to those that were best served up, he so managed himself as to abstain from tasting them, without being taken notice of. The priests, as far as it could be done, were to sit the highest at his table; some good book was to be read for half the time he sat at table; and for the remainder, it was allowed to talk of such matters as tended to edification.

"In a word, as he had learnt from St. Paul, '*that he that knows not how to govern his own family, is by no means fit to govern the Church of God,*' 1 Tim. iii. 5, he left nothing undone towards the regulating of his family in such a manner as to make it a fit model for those of his flock. So that having chosen domestics with all possible exactness, he made it his endeavour to render their lives and piety exemplary. For this reason, though there was a priest appointed to watch over them, he did not think himself dispensed from that personal care he ought in his own particular to take of them. He conversed with them, as a father with his children, and was used to say one could not be too good to them; that it was a duty to comfort them by all the most tender methods in their low condition, and that if Providence had otherwise ordained, they might have been our superiors as we are theirs.

"But he knew how to keep good nature within reasonable limits; for if any of the domestics happened to be less regular than might be expected in a well-governed family, he was reprehended immediately, or put away if the fault deserved it.

"He would have the like indulgence shown to his farmers and debtors; and this now and then to his own loss and inconvenience, insomuch that his steward frequently complained of it: but he usually answered, '*that it was not for a bishop to be rigorous in exacting his*

rents, and that nothing was more becoming his character, than now and then to recede from his just rights.'

"Over and above his particular and private alms, which must needs amount to a considerable sum, seeing he never refused any; he had others publicly distributed at the palace gate,—in the hospital, to the *Friar-minors* and to the nuns of St. Clare. 'For it is not lawful for a bishop,' said he on these occasions, 'to conceal all his good works, especially such as are of obligation, of which number is that of giving alms, because one of his greatest duties is to give a good example to his people.'

"For the same reason of his neighbours' edification, he obliged himself to be present at all the feasts of devotion which were kept in any church of the town; and in effect, he was always seen assisting there at the divine office and sermon; it being a maxim with him, that in things relating to God's or our neighbours' service, a bishop ought always to appear the first at the head of his people.

"But what above all things he enjoined himself, was not to put off to others the care of the poor and sick, but to visit them himself, to provide in person for their comfort and necessities; and this he afterwards performed with so much exactness, that it was matter of admiration how he could possibly with so little means answer so many exigencies. Indeed, in pressing occasions he even intrenched on his own chapel. But upon the main, his example shows evidently that when a man is resolved to cut off from luxury and appetite whatever it craves beyond necessaries, he will always be in a condition to give alms.

"In fine, he made a firm resolution never to go to law, but rather to suffer injuries than to prosecute any for his right. He used to say as to this point, that if St. Paul forbade law-suits to all Christians in general, by a stronger reason he forbade them to bishops; that one of the principal qualifications this Apostle required in them was that they should not love to wrangle at the bar; and he added what is known to all the world for one of his maxims, *that in a hundred pounds of law-suits, there is never one ounce of charity.*

"Francis having thus regulated the exterior, and, if I may use the expression, the outside of the bishop: see now the directions he made for his person and his interior.

"He was to rise every day at four in the morning, to make an hour's meditation, to say lauds and prime,—and then morning prayer with his family; and this done, to read the holy Scriptures till seven. He studied till nine; then he quitted his study to go to say mass; and it was his rule to say it every day. After mass, he was to be employed in the affairs of his diocese till dinner time. After dinner he allowed an hour for conversation, and then returned to the business of the diocese till the evening; and what time there was to spare he spent in study and prayer. At night after supper, some book of devotion was to be read for an hour, which furnished him with the subject of meditation for the next day. Then followed night-prayers with his family,

after which, all retiring, he was to say matins for the next day. This was the distribution of the day he prescribed to himself.

"Beside the fasts commanded by the Church, he made it his rule to fast Fridays and Saturdays, and the vigils of the feast of Our Lady.

"On solemn feasts he obliged himself to assist with his family at all the offices in the cathedral. On Sundays and common holydays, he contented himself with being present at the high mass and vespers. He resolved to make every year a retreat of ten days. For this he chose the carnival time, that he might prepare himself as he said for the better spending of the Lent, and in some sort make atonement for the disorders which are committed in those days of dissipation.

"As he was fully persuaded, what the council of Trent teaches, that *preaching is the principal function of bishops*[5]; that to give an example, Jesus Christ their model had said, *He was obliged to announce the Gospel because He was sent for that end*[6], and St. Paul, that *Christ had not sent him to baptize but to preach the word*[7]; he obliged himself to preach to his people as often as he could. Neither did the catechizing and instructing the poor and children seem to him a lessening of himself; and the reader will find hereafter, that he often discharged this function in public, and oftener still in his own palace.

"As to residence, a point of great importance, though little practised in his days, he found it too necessary, and too much recommended to bishops by the councils to dispense himself from it; he therefore proposed never to go out of his diocese without evident necessity, or at least without very cogent reasons, and those too fetched from the Church's or his neighbours' advantage[8]."

This is a beautiful plan of episcopal life and conduct, and it has the more practical value because it was drawn by one who himself really acted up to every word which it contains. The chief feature of these rules deserves to be particularly noticed. It is this: Francis de Sales gives the most prominent place to the pastoral part of the bishop's office,—the functions of the plenitude of the priesthood *with relation to the cure of souls.* His chief object seems to have been to hold the moral and religious government not only of the clergy but of the whole people, and by instruction, by fatherly care and charity, and by example, to lead them and rule them as his children. Hence his constant personal intercourse with the clergy and laity, his strict residence, his regular attendance on public worship, his frequent preaching and catechizing, and his careful economy of time. All this is in accordance with the principles of ecclesiastical law which we have endeavoured to explain and enforce.

[5] Sess. 5, c. 2. Prædicationem Evangelii sive Prædicationis munus esse Episcoporum præcipuum. [6] Luke iv. 43. [7] 1 Cor. iv.
[8] The Life of St. Francis de Sales, vol. ii. p. 104.

He was consecrated on the 8th of December, 1602, in the Church of Thorens, a large and handsome town belonging to the house of Sales. We will not dwell on the solemnity and magnificence of the ceremony, the concourse of eminent people who attended, and the rejoicings of the multitude, nor the extraordinary honours and the universal joy with which his public entrance into his episcopal town of Annecy was celebrated.

His first public act after taking possession of his see was to address his people from the pulpit, and then he proceeded to arrange all the details of his government with studious attention, and consummate ability. He next directed his care to the instruction of the youth of his diocese. He ordered catechizing to be performed on Feasts and Sundays at Annecy and throughout his diocese; and to show the esteem he had for this function he would begin it himself, and he continued it afterwards so far as his other business would permit.

"Thus," says his biographer, "this great prelate, whom Rome and Paris admired for his learning, and the court of France for his eloquence, was seen among little children, accommodating himself to their capacity and weakness, and instructing them with a patience and meekness, which was never sufficiently to be admired[9]."

He next prepared for his visitation by writing to all the rural deans of his diocese, requiring them to report exactly the state of every parish, and the behaviour and capacity of all candidates for holy orders, and in the meanwhile he made it his business to regulate the city and the neighbouring places. He was always employed either in preaching, or instructing, or prayer, or study, or some other functions of a bishop. When he was able to do so, he went to the hospitals or private houses to visit the sick. He frequently went to the houses of tradesmen and poor people, inquired into their wants, heard their complaints, and gave them comfort and relief. He carried peace on all sides. So soon as he heard of any dissension in a family, thither he went, and came not back till he had made a reconciliation. Thus we see that he was very far from contenting himself with superintendence and direction. He relied greatly on personal intercourse with his people. He considered them as his children, and took a lively interest in all that affected their peace and welfare. He was their arbiter and peacemaker in cases of difficulty and discord, and no doubt many instances occurred where all the laws and magistrates in the world could not effect what the bishop was able by his sacred character and paternal authority to accomplish.

[9] Ubi sup. p. 117.

A circumstance which took place at the commencement of his administration, shows what a correct and enlarged view this learned prelate took of the office of a bishop. While preparing to set out on his visitation, he was pressingly invited to go to preach at Dijon, out of his diocese. The mere common-place view of this matter suggests that he should have declined the invitation. But he no doubt remembered that in a certain sense every bishop is bishop of the whole Church, and that when charity and the good of the Church requires, he is bound to extend his solicitude beyond his own flock[1]. Knowing then that his authority and ability were greatly required at Dijon, he deferred his visitation, and as soon as certain political difficulties had been overcome, he went to that city, where his apostolic labours produced most extraordinary fruits. And even there, out of his own diocese, he constantly visited the sick and distressed, and gave advice to all who chose to consult him.

On his return to Annecy, he resumed his purpose of visiting his diocese, being sensible, as his biographer informs us, that it was one of the principal obligations of a bishop, and he had constantly under his eyes that advice of the Apostle, Acts xx. 28, *Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops:* and having collected and maturely considered all the reports of the rural deans, and drawn up memorials thereon, he set out for that great work on the 15th of October, 1605.

Here we must pause for a moment, and briefly delineate the scheme of episcopal visitations according to the canon law. We have shown that visitations are the chief means whereby the bishop exercises his pastoral functions over his entire flock both clergy and laity, especially as regards teaching and discipline, both moral and religious. Van Espen lays it down that visitation is absolutely necessary for the bishop's cure of souls, which is the chief point of his office, and that nothing is more strongly inculcated to bishops by the fathers and the canons than the duty of constantly visiting and travelling about their dioceses.

The canon law requires that they should be visitations not of the clergy only, but of the whole people. Thus the bishop ought to send an archdeacon or rural dean a day or two before his arrival in each parish, who is to assemble the people, announce the bishop's coming, command and require them to attend him, and then arrange with the clergy any minor affairs which may require to be despatched before the visitation. Charles

[1] Van Espen, Jus Eccles. Univ. part i. tit. xvi. caput vi. De Sollicitudine Pastorali, per tot.

Borromeo, archbishop of Milan, required his bishops to issue their pastoral letters to every parish priest before their visitation, containing the object and other matters regarding it, which were to be read during divine service on some day of festival, when the church was full; and the clergy were also required on those occasions to prepare, stir up, and exhort the people both in public and in private to receive the episcopal office of visitation[2].

The legal theory of episcopal visitation is this. He is to do nothing therein which belongs to contentious jurisdiction and judicial procedure. He is to proceed summarily and *de plano*. He may inquire into charges brought against a clerk, and direct further proceedings, but he cannot give a judicial sentence. Thus all *summary* affairs may be despatched during the visitation, and those things which cannot be so disposed of, must be reserved for the bishop's return to his city, to be then determined by him or by his officers. The visitation is thus relieved from all that might interfere with its character, as the exercise of the bishop's paternal and purely spiritual functions[3].

Let us now return to Francis de Sales. His diocese did not present any of those facilities for travelling with which our bishops are favoured by nature and art. It was indeed very populous, full of towns, boroughs, and villages,—but its extent, the want of roads and means of conveyance,—and the wildness of the country, part of which consisted in almost inaccessible mountains covered with snow, rendered the mere mechanical part of the bishop's task very arduous. Yet this bishop visited each parish separately, giving a day to each. In every parish he administered the sacrament, preached, confirmed, catechized the children himself, and received the confession of all that desired to confess to him.

"This variety of employments," says the canon Marsollier, "did not hinder him from taking diligent information of all the disorders that reigned in families. Then he laboured to settle peace between parents and their children, masters and their servants; and to reconcile such as had given public scandal by their public enmities; his admirable meekness was a key that let him into every heart, and nothing could escape his charity; the poor, the sick, the prisoners, all were the better for it; some he relieved by his alms, others by his solicitude, and some again by his credit.

"But his principal care was to have a full account, and to regulate the behaviour of the pastors of all the Churches he visited; and here he found the advantages of the memorials he had drawn up, which he constantly read upon entering the places he was going to visit. He

[2] Ib. § xiii. xiv. xv.

[3] Hericourt Loix Ecclés. p. 190, 191.

treated with honour such of the curates as led an irreproachable life, and discharged their ministry with a suitable devotion; he encouraged the good, he strengthened the weak, and, his meekness notwithstanding, he threatened to treat severely those that gave scandal, and of whom any just complaints had been made to him. Then he drew up new memorials of what he had found by his own experience, and consulted them on all occasions to prevent mistakes[4]."

Francis de Sales interrupted these functions to preach during Lent at Chambery, and to take some rest; and after his return from thence he was detained at Annecy by the outbreak of the war between the Dukes of Nemours and Savoy, and other arduous affairs: but he resumed his visitation in July, 1606, when he availed himself of the season to visit the poorest and most inaccessible places of the diocese. He had always travelled on foot, but here that practice which he had adopted through humility was by nature rendered no matter of choice. Yet he was not to be daunted, nor overcome by any difficulties and hardships. He finished at last this laborious visitation, and returned to Annecy, where he preached during the following Lent with his accustomed zeal and ability. After the Feast of Easter was passed, he, together with his friend the celebrated Favre, president of the senate of Savoy, founded and constituted the university of Annecy. The Duke of Savoy endowed that institution with abundant privileges, and the bishop opened its first convocation with a most eloquent discourse: and here we cannot but admire the thorough knowledge which this great prelate showed of every part of a bishop's office. He was indeed not only a learned divine, but also accomplished in the civil and canon law, which he had studied at Padua with so much success, that he was presented to his doctor's degree by the famous civilian Pancirolus, who in an eloquent eulogium, held him up as an example to the whole university. There, no doubt, he acquired that judicial mind, that vigorous and clear perception of justice, which are essential to the character of a perfect bishop. And thus we find that whenever he was called upon, either as bishop of the diocese or as apostolical commissioner, to decide on any differences among the clergy, he always acquitted himself in such a manner that no one ventured to question the validity and equity of his decrees, except in one instance, in which his judgment was affirmed on appeal.

He was not discouraged by the labours and hardships of his primary visitation, for after two years had elapsed since its

[4] The Life of St. Francis de Sales, vol. ii. p. 185, 186.

conclusion, he began another visitation, for the sake of parts of his diocese which seemed to need his further care. He was persuaded that a first visit would hardly give him a general superficial knowledge of his people's necessities, that it was not enough to make a few useful ordinances, but care ought to be taken to see them executed. Experience had likewise shown him the necessity there was sometimes of adding to them, and at other times abridging them; and there are few general laws but that now and then stand in need of being adapted to the circumstances of the times and the exigences of particulars. And we find that in subsequent years, as the important and arduous affairs which were thrown on him by events, or entrusted to him by the Pope and the Duke of Savoy, as well as his care of his city and its neighbouring district allowed, he continued from time to time to visit parts of his diocese. His industry and zeal were indeed extraordinary. When we look at the multitude of weighty affairs which passed through his hands, his labour in writing, and the difficulties which political events cast in his way, we cannot but wonder that he should have been able to devote so much of his solicitude to the immediate personal care of the souls of his people. He did not lack good excuses and justifications for confining himself to superintendence and direction. But he would leave undone no part of the duty of a bishop, least of all the part which concerns the cure of souls. Thus he took no account of the habits of the world, but aimed at nothing short of the absolute perfection of his office, its thorough completeness in every branch, and the execution of every part, so far as the physical laws of nature permitted.

So high a degree of sanctity and such great self-denial are to be attained by very few. How few bishops, if any, in our times have to encounter such difficulties as he overcame! He was comparatively poor; he lived in the midst of war and political discord; his diocese was disturbed by violent religious controversy, and its extent and the ruggedness of its country rendered communications difficult and even dangerous. All these obstacles he vanquished. What would he not have done in this favoured country, with all the appliances of advanced civilization! His life would in all probability have been prolonged, for with an excellent constitution he died in his 56th year, worn out by his sacred duties, and his apostolical labours would, therefore, have been so much the more extensive and fruitful.

But our object has been to set forth by his example, rather the nature and extent of his episcopal actions, the spirit of the apostolical functions which he performed, than his own holiness and self-denial. We have endeavoured to present to our readers

the ideal of the office of a bishop in the person of Francis de Sales, more than the character of Francis de Sales himself.

We will now proceed to lay before our readers a sketch of a prelate of our own Church and country, who not a little resembles the Bishop of Geneva,—Bishop Wilson.

"Having," says his biographer, "the precepts of his Divine Master constantly before him, with the lives and writings of the Apostles and primitive Christian fathers, he from them laid down his plan of life, and steadily copied their example.

"There is scarcely a part of human science that could be valuable and serviceable to his diocese, which he did not understand. He was well acquainted with the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages. . . . .

"He had studied and he practised physic with success. For some time after he settled there, he was the only physician of the island, keeping a shop of drugs for general use, which he distributed, as well as his advice, gratis; but when some gentlemen of the faculty came to settle on the island, he gave up to them that part of the practice which alone could conduce to their emolument—attending on the rich, but the poor he kept always to himself.

"He instructed young candidates for orders, and maintained them in his house, under his own immediate care; nor did he ordain them until he found, on a strict and careful examination, that they were perfectly qualified.

"He was an able mathematician, an excellent botanist; and if we view him as a farmer, we find that by a judicious and successful cultivation, from the ecclesiastical demesnes (which before his coming to the island produced little or nothing) he in a few years fed and clothed the poor of his diocese. The whole was a sheepwalk, but by tillage and manure, it bore excellent corn.

"He was so charitable, that it was not unaptly observed by a gentleman of the island, that he kept beggars from everybody's door but his own.

"He always kept an open hospitable table, covered with the produce of his own demesnes, in a plentiful, not extravagant manner. As the friendly host, or master of that table, he was the most entertaining and agreeable, as well as instructive, of men. His manners, though always consistently adorned with Christian gravity, were ever gentle and polite; and from his natural sagacity and distinguished erudition, he seemed to have the world in his possession. He was the divine, the scholar, and the gentleman.

"Cardinal Fleury wanted much to see him, and sent over on purpose to inquire after his health, his age, and the date of his consecration, as they were the two oldest bishops, and he believed the poorest, in Europe; at the same time inviting him to France. The Bishop sent the Cardinal an answer which gave him so high an opinion of him, that he obtained an order that no French privateer should ravage the Isle of Man.

"He often on Sunday visited the different parishes of his diocese without giving them any notice; and after doing the duty of the day, returned to Bishops-Court to dinner, and this after he was eighty years of age, on horseback. This was a constant obligation on the clergy and the people to be mindful of their duty. And four times in every year he made a general visitation, inquiring into the behaviour and conduct of all the parishioners, and exhorting them to the practice of religion and virtue: and at his annual convocations he delivered his charges with the divine pathos, grace, and dignity of an inspired apostle.

"He was so great a friend to toleration, that the papists who resided in the island loved and esteemed him, and not unfrequently attended his sermons and his prayers. The dissenters, too, attended even the Communion Service, as he had allowed them a liberty to sit or stand; which however they did not make use of, but behaved in the same manner with those of the Established Church. A few Quakers, who resided on the island, loved and respected him.

"He was so fond of his flock, and so attached to his diocese, that no temptations could seduce him from their service, no offers could remove him.

"I have already mentioned that Queen Anne would have given him an English bishopric; King George the First made him the same offer; and, in the year 1735, Queen Caroline was very desirous of keeping him in England; but though he was much bound to her Majesty's goodness, he would not be persuaded. One day, as he was coming to pay his usual duty to the Queen, when she had several prelates with her, she turned round to her levee, and said, 'See here, my Lords, is a Bishop who does not come for a translation.' 'No, indeed, please your Majesty,' said our good Bishop, 'I will not leave my wife in my old age because she is poor.'

"He never interfered in temporal or political concerns, unless when called upon at the request of the inhabitants to serve them on particular occasions. The whole conduct and every action of his life showed him to be no otherwise a man of this world, than as a minister to do good to his fellow-creatures while living in it; and the people of the island were so thoroughly persuaded of his receiving a larger portion of God's blessing, that they seldom began harvest till he did; and if he passed along by the field, they would leave their work to ask his blessing, assured that that day would be propitious. Nor was this opinion confined to the obscure corner of the world where he resided: in Warrington, nay in London, there are those now living who can remember crowds of people flocking round him with the cry of '*Bless me too, my lord*[5]!'"

It is interesting to observe that Bishop Wilson seems to have taken the same view of the episcopal office as Francis de Sales. In both we find the same pastoral care of the laity, the

[5] Life of Bishop Wilson, by the Rev. C. Cruttwell. Bishop Wilson's Works, vol. i. p. 199, &c.

same indefatigable zeal in visitation, in preaching, and in personal works of charity, and the same attachment to his diocese.

Bishop Wilson did not confine himself to administration and the government of the clergy. He showed an active and personal solicitude in every thing that concerned the people. Thus, when a criminal was condemned and executed in his diocese for a very cruel murder[6], the Bishop addressed a pastoral letter to his clergy, the very first paragraph of which shows how strongly he felt that his office involved the supreme pastoral care of the people. It is as follows:—

"We having at this time a mournful instance before us of an unhappy man under the righteous sentence of condemnation for the dreadful sin of murder, attended with uncommon circumstances of the most barbarous cruelty, let us consider, I beseech you, what God will expect especially of us his ministers upon this occasion; what good we may probably do, and what future evils we may hope, through the grace of God, to prevent, by plainly and affectionately laying before our people the true causes which lead to such dreadful sins."

And then the Bishop goes on to point out and enforce various matters most apposite and valuable, and ends with a prayer for the prisoner under sentence, which he desires may be read in every church in the diocese. Thus he adopted means to direct what is called public opinion into the right channel, exerting at the same time his paternal solicitude for the unhappy criminal, by calling for the prayers of the Church on his behalf. He did not stand aloof, as though this were a matter only concerning the civil government, because he felt that every thing that related to the moral condition and discipline of the people was properly within the sphere of the bishop's duty. On another similar occasion the Bishop not only wrote to his clergy, and ordered prayers in all the churches for the condemned prisoners, but he himself from the pulpit called on the people to join him in prayer for those miserable men, concluding with a most impressive exhortation. He felt that all the people were his children, and required his immediate, direct, and personal care. He was the bishop not of the clergy only, but of all the people,—their supreme pastor, their friend and their father.

Let us now turn to the contemplation of another great prelate, differing much from Francis de Sales and from Bishop Wilson, and combining the qualities of an apostolic bishop with those of a courtier and a statesman; namely, Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray. His defect was, that he valued greatness and power, and

[6] Ib. p. 184, 185.

the applause of the world, too highly. He was indeed well qualified for ambition. He was clothed with all the grace and brilliancy of the most magnificent court in the world; he was witty, accomplished, splendid, and majestic. These things were a snare to him, and yet he understood and thoroughly realized the episcopal character. There is much to be learned from his life, and especially it is very interesting to see how he was rendered a great bishop by the influence of his office, the spirit of which he undoubtedly studied and understood in all its details.

The excellent and admirable Duke de St. Simon has given us a delineation of Fenelon with all the richness and breadth of colouring, and reality of a grand full-length portrait by Vandyke or Rubens. We will not attempt to translate the first part at least of this master-piece of biographical writing, which is not surpassed by any thing in Lord Clarendon, but faithfully present it to the reader.

"Ce[7] prélat était un grand homme maigre, bien fait, pâle, avec un grand nez, des yeux dont le feu et l'esprit sortaient comme un torrent, et une physionomie telle que je n'en ai point vu qui y ressemblât et qui ne se pouvait oublier quand on ne l'aurait vue qu'une fois. Elle rassemblait tout, et les contraires n'y combattaient point. Elle avait de la gravité et de la galanterie, du sérieux et de la gaieté; elle sentait également le docteur, l'évêque et le grand seigneur; ce qui y surnageait ainsi que dans toute sa personne, c'etait la finesse, l'esprit, les grâces, la décence, et surtout la noblesse. Il fallait effort pour cesser de le regarder. Tous ses portraits sont parlants, sans toutefois avoir pu attraper la justesse et l'harmonie qui frappait dans l'original, et la délicatesse de chaque caractère que ce visage rassemblait. Ses manières y répondaient dans la même proportion, avec une aisance qui en donnait aux autres, et cet air et ce bon goût qu'on ne tient que de l'usage de la meilleure compagnie et du grand monde, qui se trouvait répandu de soi-même dans toutes ces conversations, avec cela une éloquence naturelle, douce, fleurie; une politesse insinuante, mais noble et proportionnée; élocution facile, nette, agréable; un air de clarté et de netteté pour se faire entendre dans les matières les plus embarassées et les plus dures; avec cela un homme qui ne voulait jamais avoir plus d'esprit que ceux à qui il parlait, qui se mettait à la portée de chacun sans le faire jamais sentir, qui les mettait à l'aise, et qui semblait enchanter, de façon qu'on ne pouvait le quitter, ni s'en défendre, ni ne pas chercher à le retrouver. C'est ce talent si rare, et qu'il avait au dernier degré, qui lui tint tous ses amis si entièrement attachés toute sa vie, malgré sa chute, et qui, dans leur dispersion, les réunissait pour se parler de lui, pour le regretter, pour le désirer, pour se tenir de plus en plus à lui, comme les Juifs à Jérusalem, et soupirer après son retour et l'espérer toujours, comme ce malheureux peuple

[7] St. Simon, Mémoires, tom. xxii. p. 135, &c.

attend et soupire après le Messie. C'est aussi par cette autorité de prophète qu'il s'était acquise sur les siens, qu'il s'était accoutumé à une domination, qui dans sa douceur ne voulait point de résistance. Aussi n'aurait-il pas longtemps souffert de compagnon s'il fût revenu à la cour, et entré dans le conseil, qui fut toujours son grand but ; et une fois ancré et hors des besoins des autres, il eût été bien dangéreux non-seulement de lui résister, mais de n'être pas toujours pour lui dans la souplesse et dans l'admiration."

Here is a description of a splendid court prelate,—a finished gentleman, and a person admirably calculated to be the leader of a party. The latter is a very dangerous qualification for a churchman, and it might have been the destruction of Fenelon. But he was also a good and devout Christian,—a learned divine ; and those apparently merely worldly qualities contributed to make him a great bishop, notwithstanding the unfortunate mixture of ambition, which gave him a worldly tendency. They made him the apostle of the great and brilliant, and endowed him with an extraordinary power of governing mankind, especially men of the world, courtiers, and soldiers. Without his truly episcopal spirit, his thorough knowledge of the nature of his sacred office, he would have been a mere worldly prelate. These qualities became the more conspicuous in the latter years of his life, when the disfavour of Louis XIV. excluded him from the court. Living without interval in his diocese, his episcopal qualities shone forth with extraordinary splendour.

" Retired in his diocese, he lived there with the piety and application of a pastor, and the art and magnificence of a man who has renounced nothing, and who looks to every thing and every person. Never did any man more desire to please—and to please the servant as well as the master ; no man carried that desire further, nor succeeded more entirely in so doing. Cambray is a place of general resort and passage ; and nothing can equal the politeness, the discernment, and the agreeable manner in which he received all who came there. At first he was avoided : he ran after no one ; but by degrees the charm of his manners drew to him a certain number. Under the countenance of that little multitude, many of those whom fear had kept away, but who wished to sow seeds for other times, were happy to have opportunities of passing through Cambray. One after the other all rushed there. When the Duke of Burgundy seemed to be important, the court of the prelate increased ; and it became a real court as soon as his pupil succeeded to the title of Dauphin. He had gained the hearts of the army by the number of persons whom he had received, and of those whom he had lodged in his palace during their passage through Cambray ; and by his care of the sick and the wounded who had been brought to his city on different occasions. Assiduous at the hospitals, and with the humblest, and attentive to the principal officers, keeping many of them under his

roof for months together, and until their perfect recovery, watching like a true pastor over the weal of their souls, with that knowledge of the world which enabled him to gain them over, and induced many others to address themselves to him, not refusing himself to the meanest person in the hospitals who wished to see him, and whom he would attend to as if he had nothing else to do; he was not less solicitous for their corporeal relief. Broth, nourishment, consolations in times of sorrow, and very frequently remedies, came in abundance from his palace; and notwithstanding this number of things, an inconceivable degree of care that every thing might be of the best quality. He himself presided at the most important medical consultations. It is astonishing to what a degree he became the idol of the army, and how loudly his name echoed even in the midst of the court."

Fenelon was thoroughly imbued with the principles touching his office, which we have endeavoured to sketch above. He was well aware of the importance of the pastoral character of that office, and of the supreme cure of souls which essentially belongs to it. He was accordingly not satisfied with general superintendence, government, and direction, but he maintained a personal care of the people, and intercourse with them. Thus we shall see that he attached great importance to visitation, and to paternal intercourse with the people in every village, and that though a great personage, he did not keep his clergy at a distance.

"His charities, his episcopal visitations repeated several times in the year, and which made him thoroughly acquainted with every part of his diocese, the wisdom and mildness of his government, his frequent preaching in the city and in the villages, his facility of access, his humanity with the small, his politeness with others, and his natural graces, which increased the value of all that he did and said, made the people adore him; and the clergy, of whom he declared himself to be the brother and the father, all carried him in their hearts. In the midst of all this art and desire to please, and to please so generally, there was nothing mean, nor common, nor affected, nor out of place; and every thing was according to the most exquisite fitness. He was easily approached, and he despatched business with promptness and the utmost disinterestedness. One spirit, inspired by his own, prevailed among all who were employed under him in that great diocese; never was there any scandal nor any thing violent done against any one; and every thing in him and belonging to him was regulated by the most perfect propriety."

The conduct of the Archbishop of Cambray to his clergy is in accordance with the principles of the canon law. Thus we find in the decree of Gratian these words of St. Jerome. "Esto subjectus Pontifici tuo, et quasi animæ parentem suscipe, ... Sed episcopi *sacerdotes se esse* noverint, *non dominos*, honorent

clericos quasi clericos, ut et ipsis a clericis quasi episcopis honor deferatur. Scitum est illud oratoris Domitii: Cur ego te, inquit, habeam ut principem, cum tu me non habeas ut senatorem? Quod Aaron et filios ejus, hoc episcopum et presbyteros esse noverimus [8]." And again the council of Carthage says, "episcopum *non dominum, sed collegam* presbyterorum cognoscat [9]." And again the same council says, "Episcopus in ecclesia et in consessu presbyterorum sublimior sedeat. Intra domum vero *collegam se presbyterorum* esse cognoscat [1]." It is indeed most pernicious for a bishop to act as if he were a lord over his clergy and not their colleague, a lord and not a priest. But let us see how Fenelon managed the business of his diocese.

"His mornings were passed in the midst of the business of his diocese. As his genius was elevated and penetrating, and his residence constant, and as no day passed without his settling whatever affairs presented themselves, this was every day a brief and light occupation."

That great churchman knew that the mind of a bishop should not be engrossed with the business of administration, of which the greater part may by activity and method be despatched speedily, or left, under proper superintendence, to the bishop's officers. No doubt the affairs of his extensive diocese might have taken up the greater portion of every day, but this would have interfered with his pastoral functions, his study, and his devotions, and made him almost inaccessible to his clergy and people over whom he would have had little or no influence. How did the archbishop spend the remainder of his day after the hours of business?

"He afterwards received those who wished to see him; then he said mass, and he was not long in doing so. It was always in his own chapel, excepting on the days on which he officiated episcopally, or when some particular reason made him perform divine service elsewhere. On his return he dined with the company, which was always numerous; ate little, and not solidly, but sat long at table for the sake of others, and charmed them with the ease, the variety, and the natural tone and the cheerfulness of his conversation, but without ever descending to any thing not worthy of a bishop and a *grand seigneur*. After rising from table he remained but a short time with his guests. He had accustomed them to live in his house without constraint, and to give himself none for them. He then went into his study, and worked some hours; prolonging his labours if the weather was bad, and if he had nothing to do elsewhere."

[8] Cap. vii. *Esto* subjectus, dist. xcv.

[9] Ib. cap. viii. *Episcopus in quolibet.*

[1] Ib. cap. x. *Episcopus in Ecclesia.* And so the same council forbids a bishop to allow a priest to remain standing while he himself is seated. Ib. cap. ix.

Fenelon knew that there should be in the bishop nothing harsh, nor repulsive, nor pedantic, nor pompous[2], no official stiffness, nor any want of that excellent polish which results from benevolence, Christian charity, and humility, mingled with the dignity of highmindedness and refinement. He was hospitable as St. Paul requires that a bishop should be[3]; but his hospitality was that of a prelate and a person of the highest station and breeding. It had all the amenity of the best and most polished society,—and at the same time the strict correctness and the scrupulous morality of a conscientious and irreproachable ecclesiastic.

"On quitting his study he used to pay visits or walk out of town. He was very fond of that kind of exercise, and liked to prolong it; and if there were none of those whom he lodged, or some distinguished person with him, he was accompanied by a vicar-general or some other ecclesiastic, and conversed with them about the diocese and about matters of piety or learning. He passed his evenings with the guests who lived in his house, supped with the principal officers when troops were passing through, and then his table was served as at dinner. He ate still less than at dinner, and went to bed before midnight. Although his table was handsome and delicate, and every thing about him was according to the condition of a *grand seigneur*, there was nothing which did not savour of episcopacy, and the most scrupulous rule amidst the politest and mildest freedom. He was himself an ever-present example, but one which it was impossible to reach. He was ever a true prelate, ever a *grand seigneur*, and ever the author of Telemachus. Never did he utter a word regarding the court, or politics, whatever it was, which could be found fault with, nor which savoured in the slightest degree of meanness, regrets, or flattery, and never any thing which could even hint what he had been nor what he might still become. In the midst of so many great engagements there was the utmost order in his domestic affairs, and the greatest discipline in the whole diocese; but without littleness, without pedantry, and without any one ever having been importuned about doctrine."

It is impossible to read this account of the great Archbishop of Cambray without admiring the high standard by which he regulated his episcopal life. He had the largest and most comprehensive idea of the bishop's office and duties. He did not look on the bishop as a governor of the clergy, nor as an administrator of property only. He considered the bishop according to the

[2] In the Decree of Gratian a bishop is required to be, among other qualifications, *humilis, affabilis, misericors.* Dist. xxiii. cap. ii.

[3] 1 Timothy iii. 2. And in the Decree of Gratian, Gregory the Great, dist. lxxxv., held the Archdeacon Florentinus unfit to become a bishop, because "*accepimus . . . . . ita eum tenacem existere ut in domo ejus amicus ad charitatem nunquam introeat.*" He was a mean, shabby man, whose house was never open to a friend.

principles of Scripture and ecclesiastical law, as the supreme pastor with cure of souls of the whole diocese, and in one sense, of the whole universal Church,—the father of his people,—the successor of the apostles,—the necessary imitator of their pastoral solicitude, and Christ's representative on earth. Thus no one was so humble as to be below his affectionate care,—and no one so great as to be above his apostolical authority and influence. To all he was accessible, to all a friend, to all equally a father. In the city, great nobles and commanders of armies courted his approbation; in the villages and the remote parts of his diocese, the poor flocked to see him, to receive his blessing and hear his instructions. He was essentially *the bishop of the laity* of all classes and conditions, as well as of the clergy; and to the clergy he was a brother and a colleague, as well as a spiritual father and governor. What may not be done by such a bishop!

The contemplation of Francis de Sales, of Bishop Wilson, and of Archbishop Fenelon, suggests to the mind of an English churchman matters of profound importance, bearing on the present condition of discipline in this country, so far as it regards the great body of the laity. We have already referred to the difficulties which stand in the way of the revival of that discipline. How far it may be possible gradually to carry it we cannot determine; but it is evident where this great work of restoration must begin. It must begin from the exercise of the direct influence of the pastoral office of the bishop over the laity. It must begin by the bishop, as the successor of the apostles, exerting that kind of immediate personal influence and authority over the laity of all classes, which is so beautifully shown in the lives of Francis de Sales, Bishop Wilson, and Fenelon. The bishop must assume, by virtue of his office, to be the centre of the whole moral and religious government and discipline of the people; not merely by superintendence and direction of the clergy, but in his own person—directly—immediately,—by constant intercourse with the people as their spiritual judge and adviser, by his presence in each parish, by teaching, by the frequent administration of divine service in all parts of his diocese, and by preaching, not only in towns, but in obscure villages, not only to the rich and educated, but to the poor and ignorant. His visitation must be the great tribunal of morals for those purposes which no laws and no magistrates can accomplish. The whole population must look forward to the bishop's visitation as a great festivity, as a joyful event, as the coming of their spiritual father to instruct them, to bless them, to heal their dissensions, and to exercise over them a paternal censorship and

solicitude. The people will be easily accustomed to feel and realize the episcopal office. They will soon learn to appreciate the benefits which they will derive therefrom. There is now a strong feeling in the minds of thoughtful men, who stand away from the turmoil of party and the struggles of commercial speculation, that some new element of government is needed to stem the torrent of mean ambition and covetousness, which threatens to overwhelm all honour and justice in this nation. If, indeed, wealth and industry constitute happiness and greatness, then is this country happy and great; but of all servitudes, that is the most miserable which renders man a mere instrument for the accumulation of treasure. Such is the condition, not of the working population alone, who can barely support life by incessant toil, which without the instinct of self-preservation would render life a burthen, but of thousands who think themselves powerful and fortunate, whose souls are bowed down to the abject worship of riches, until they even sacrifice their lives, after destroying their consciences, to obtain the means of gratifying unbounded luxury, and insatiable love of ostentatious power. In the midst of this general demoralization, which daily shows itself in folly, excess, baseness, and crime, and more or less affects every class of the community, the moral discipline of the Church is the great remedy to which honest men look with anxiety and hope. They look to the Divine institution of the episcopal office and polity as the means of reviving justice, honour, and religion, which no laws, no magistrate, and no systems of national education can do. In that office there is a latent force, which only requires to be called forth, fully sufficient for this magnificent task of reformation. It is the great talisman of the Church's power, the great secret of spiritual government, without which ecclesiastical polity becomes a mere form of administration and outward discipline. But the glorious institution of apostolical authority cannot shine forth in all its splendour until it is fully understood and appreciated. Its true spirit and extent must first be realized by profound and enlarged study of principles drawn from the public law of the Church. Then nothing more will be required than to substitute those principles for the routine of modern practice and the prejudices of modern society.

Art. II.—*The Theogony of the Hindoos; with their systems of Philosophy and Cosmogony. An Essay. By* Count M. Björnstjerna, *Author of* "*The British Empire in the East.*" London: Murray.

The religion of the Hindus has been the subject of much able illustration and of much profound research, but of those writers who have engaged in the inquiry, few have prosecuted it in all its extent, or upon a sufficiently comprehensive plan, and many have been misled by partial and imperfect information, by enthusiastic and misplaced admiration, or by interested and malignant prejudices. We have consequently yet to learn, if not what the religion of the Hindus actually is, yet what it was, when, according to Creuzer, "its naive and sublime forms, its simple and profound conceptions, its bold and extensive system, constituted the foundation and explained the meaning of the dogmas and religious symbols of most of the nations of antiquity."

In the first contemplation of a subject of this vast and interesting nature, we are liable to be distracted by the novelty and number of details yet indistinct, and behold them through a mist in which the most prominent particulars are alone discernible; and when they are magnified beyond their due dimensions, displaced from their proper positions, and distorted in their relative bearings and proportions. It is only as time advances and the vapours clear away, that the several parts are reduced to their natural size and shape, and are capable of combination as a regular and coherent whole.

It rarely happens, however, that the ardour of inquiry can be taught to await for the gradual withdrawal of the veil which clouds the first glimmerings of truth. Strongly impressed by the exaggerated outline of what is dimly visible, a ready belief is entertained that all is fully and distinctly beheld, and particulars are generalised and systems are compounded long before the materials have been adequately collected or suitably prepared; the fabric presently falls to pieces, but the result affords no instruction, and speculation is speedily "at its idle work again."

The history of the researches of European orientalists regarding the Hindu religion, remarkably illustrates this tendency to hasty and premature conclusions. When the pretensions of the Hindus to high antiquity, and their supposed possession of written authorities much more ancient than the Pentateuch, were first made

known, they found a ready acceptance with those who were incredulous of the credibilities of Scripture, and were confidently wielded as weapons fatal to the veracity of the inspired record. Further acquaintance with them revealed their true character, and proved them to be either astronomical computations based on data only partially true, or mythological fictions, having but an imperfect and erroneous connexion with actual chronology. Opinion, indeed, then became liable to a violent reaction, and the whole Hindu system was affirmed to be but a few centuries remote. The *juste milieu* has not yet been agreed upon; and notwithstanding that great names are enrolled on either part, the antiquity and authenticity of the astronomy of the Hindus, the basis of their whole scheme of chronology, have yet to be ascertained.

In like manner, our first impressions of the mythology of the Hindus were strong in favour of its remote date, and of its relationship to the superstitions of the most celebrated nations of the ancient world. Sir William Jones found obvious analogies between the gods of Egypt, Greece, Italy, and India; Paolino and Wilford followed in the same track; and both the author of the "Religions de l'Antiquité" and his translator and annotator, intimate a perfect conviction of both the antiquity and affinity of the principal features of the Hindu mythology with those of Egypt and of Greece. Although, however, these assertions may be admitted in a general sense, yet it is now certain that the points of resemblance upon which greatest stress has been laid are in many instances fallacious, and that much which is incontestably of comparatively recent date has been so blended and confounded with what is probably old, that it is difficult to draw a line between them. The Puranas, which furnish many of the most characteristic legends of Hinduism as it is, and which were long spoken of as authorities whose origin was lost in the depth of ages, are now, thanks to the industry of M. Burnouf and Prof. Wilson, presented to us in their true character, and the Bhagavat and Vishnu Puranas are shown to be compilations, of which the latter cannot be older than the tenth century of the Christian era, while the former is as late as the twelfth. That they embody traditions of a much greater antiquity is undoubtedly true, but even of them how much is to be regarded as archaic is yet to be determined. In the mean time, some of the most fundamental dogmas have been rudely assailed, and it has been denied that the indication of the triad of gods, Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva, as the personified creative, preserving, and destroying powers of one supreme god, can be traced in the primitive doctrines of the Brahmans. However this may be, it is now generally admitted that the worship of Siva,

especially as *le grand symbole de la Trinité qui a fait le tour du monde comme celui du Phallus ou Lingam*, derives no countenance from the ritual of the Vedas, and is consequently no part of the primary and unadulterated scheme of Hinduism. The periods to be ascribed to these hitherto considered essential and primitive articles of the old Hindu faith are subjects for further investigation; and there are various other debateable matters which sufficiently show, that we are not yet out of the fog,—that we have much still to learn before we can presume to assign to the mythological fictions of the Hindus the order they should follow in the development of the Hindu religion, the place which they are entitled to occupy in the history of the religions of mankind.

The work which has suggested these remarks, "The Theogony of the Hindoos," by Count M. Björnstjerna, is not calculated, we fear, to dissipate our perplexities, or to throw any light upon the true history and real character of that which it professes to describe. The noble author deserves every possible commendation for so laudable an employment of his time and talents, and for patriotic anxiety to communicate to his countrymen in Sweden a share of that acquaintance with India, both ancient and modern, which is so perseveringly sought for and so successfully attained in Germany and France. Unfortunately his purposes are better entitled to commendation than their execution. The Count is a statesman and a politician: he is not an orientalist nor an antiquarian. In his "History of India," a work published some time ago, he is most at home in statistical details, and his work may be consulted with advantage for particulars relating to the government of the East India Company, and the financial and military resources of their dominions. When he is among the people and princes of India he is in an unknown world, and hits upon extraordinary discoveries. As one instance of this, we may notice his proof of an affinity between the swarthy races of India and the blue-eyed warriors of Scandinavia,—a discovery to which he reverts in his Theogony. The proof is the name of Uddin, or Odin, borne, as he affirms, by a dynasty of kings of Delhi. He is apparently unaware that *ud-din* is only part of a title very commonly assumed by *Mohammedan* sovereigns, implying their devotion to *the religion*, *al-din*, of their prophet; as Ghias-ad-din, Shems-ad-din, the defender—the sun—of the faith, and the like, and no more of kin to the Hindus than to the Scandinavians, to Odin than to Brahma, to the language of the Edda than to that of the Vedas, unless it could be established that both were but transcripts of the Koran.

The whole title of the present work is, "The Theogony of the Hindoos, with their systems of Philosophy and Cosmogony: an

Essay:" the latter qualification is intended apparently to qualify expectation, and prepare us for a conciseness of description wholly disproportioned to the extent and importance of the subjects. We had no right to look for any novelty in a work avowedly made up from other authorities, but we had hoped that the compilation would have supplied a want which still prevails even in English literature,—a general but comprehensive account of the whole Hindu system, compiled from the authentic materials which now abound. We have not, in fact, any available authority to which to apply promptly and commodiously for information regarding the religion and institutions of India. Moor's "Hindu Pantheon" was compiled at an early date, almost exclusively from the first volumes of the "Asiatic Researches of Bengal," from the papers of Sir Wm. Jones and Major Wilford. It is a serviceable work as far as it goes, but is in arrear of our present knowledge. Ward's "Hindus" is liable to a similar objection, and is also exceptionable as attempting too much with inadequate materials. It is rather an account of the Hindus of Bengal than of the Hindus of India, and is often deficient in candour and good taste. We have still therefore to seek for a competent guide to a knowledge of the Hindus, and we shall not find it in this "Essay," although, in addition to the important topics specified above, it comprises a variety of others, and devotes a few pages to the laws and institutions of the Hindus, the distinctions of caste, the chief literary compositions, the Buddhists and other religious divisions of the people, the Fire-worshippers, Syro-Christians, and Mohammedans of India. The accounts are necessarily concise and meagre, and yet they offer no inconsiderable number of unauthorized statements and palpable mistakes.

The very desultory nature of Count Björnstjerna's descriptions renders it impossible to adopt any connected and methodical examination of his work; we shall therefore confine our observations to the subjects announced in the title-page, "The Theogony, Philosophy, and Cosmogony of the Hindus."

Upon the first of these topics, notwithstanding the prominent place it takes in the designation of the book, little or nothing is to be found. We are told, indeed, that the religion of the Hindus as it appears in the Vedas, is "a monotheism encompassed by or founded on a Sabæistic form;" that after some ten or eleven centuries a new commentator of the Vedas, Menu, in a great measure altered the contents of the sacred scripture, and that the Brahmanical religion received a still further development by means of the Puranas, which bring the doctrine from the principle of the Unity to that of the Triad or Trimurthi, or rather combine the

principle of the Triad with that of the Unity. The origin of the Brahmanical Trinity is conjectured to have originated in the following manner: "The Vedas represent the Almighty as creator, preserver, and destroyer, and in the last character in respect to the four great periods of the world, or Yugs, which, according to the Vedas, are separated from each other by means of great universal destructions. From these three attributes the Puranas form three distinct deities under the names of Brahmá (the Creator), Vishnu (the Preserver), and Siva (the Destroyer)." Allusion is then made to the Avatáras, saints or incarnations of Vishnu and Siva upon earth in a human form, of which it is stated there have been nine of the former and two of the latter; and it is then affirmed that the Hindus are divided into three sects, as followers of Vedantism, Vishnuism, and Sivism, worshipping respectively Brahma, Vishnu, and Siva. Brief mention is made of two of Vishnu's Avataras, Ráma and Krishna; and Siva, it is said, is worshipped under "two symbolical forms," and this is all that we have upon the subject of the Hindu Pantheon; no allusion being made to any of the multitudinous array of divinities, which form in various degrees essential parts of the system, nor to their origin, history, or functions: even what is said abounds with misconception.

The religion of the Hindus, we are told, as it appears in the Vedas, is "a monotheism founded upon Sabæism." Before this can be admitted, it must be asked, how much do we know of the doctrine of the Vedas? and how far does that knowledge justify the unqualified assertion that they teach the worship of one god, distinguishable as a trinity by his attributes, as creator, preserver, and destroyer of the universe.

To the first of these questions we shall look in vain to our author for a reply. He tells us, indeed, that the Vedas form the basis of the religion of the Hindoos, that they consist of four distinct parts or books, and that each is composed of three divisions,—the Mantra, which contains hymns and prayers to the Almighty; the second, Brahmana, which consists "of the precepts of religion and theological arguments;" and the third, which is termed Upanishad, forming "an abstract of the other two;" that they are written in a metaphorical style, are not clear, and are often contradictory; and that an abridgment of them, called Vedanta, was made by Vyasa 2000 years before Christ; that only small portions have been translated into the European languages; that Colebrooke's English versions are most to be depended upon; and that although the translated portions are insufficient to enable one to form a right judgment of the actual

contents of the doctrine exhibited, it is evident that it was a monotheism encompassed by a Sabæistic form or founded upon it.

Although reference is here made to the means we possess of knowing what the Vedas contain, it may be doubted if the writer has taken much trouble to become fully acquainted with them. The manner in which Colebrooke's "versions" are mentioned is a sufficient justification of the doubt. Mr. Colebrooke's "Essay on the Vedas," first published in the "Asiatic Researches," and since incorporated in his "Miscellaneous Essays," is not a mere series of translations: it is a general description of the Vedas, an account of their origin, arrangement, composition, and doctrines, illustrated by occasional translations, forming an invaluable introduction to the study of the Vedas, but necessarily leaving very much to be determined beyond the limits of the Essay. The want is still very imperfectly supplied, but there were other materials within his reach, which might have enabled the Count to have been more precise and accurate in his statements. The first book of the Rig-veda, with a Latin translation by the late learned and estimable Dr. Rosen, published by the Oriental Translation Fund, has been some years before the public, and the text and translation of the ritual portion of the Sáma-veda, by Mr. Stevenson of Bombay, published by the same fund in conjunction with the Oriental Text Society, had preceded the "Theogony of the Hindus" long enough to have been consulted by its author, and to have suggested to him the propriety of speaking with more hesitation of the doctrine of the Vedas, and with more reserve of their monotheism.

The specimens we have now within our reach enable us to conceive a tolerably correct notion of the character of the practical, which is no doubt the archaic form of the Vedas. This consists not of a uniform and systematic body of writings, composed upon a definite plan, and for a single and determinate purpose, but of a number of separate and detached hymns, the work of various hands and of evidently different periods,—the spontaneous effusions of venerable men, in harmony with the prevailing belief and practices of their time, and intended chiefly, if not solely, for the use of their own families and disciples. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of these canticles were scattered among the people, or preserved traditionally in different households, in a more or less isolated state, until the age of generalization and system had arrived, when the *disjecta membra* were collected, studied, and taught, and schools were formed for their preservation, classification, and use, as a universal and popular liturgy. This classification, according to our author, occurred two thousand years before

our era, but upon what grounds he assigns to the aggregation of the hymns of the Vedas such an antiquity he has not informed us. The data furnished us by Mr. Colebrooke, and they are the best we yet have, carry the collection and arrangement of the Vedas no higher than the fourteenth century before Christianity, an antiquity sufficiently remote when the progressive and accumulative character of the materials is considered.

Until we have translations of the entire Vedas, it were very unsafe to say that monotheism is no part of their primitive doctrine. As far, however, as we are yet acquainted with the practical part, with the hymns and prayers used at seasons of actual worship and adoration, we have no reason to credit the assertion that they are addressed "to the Almighty," or that they inculcate "Monotheism." They are exclusively polytheistic, addressed principally, though not solely, to Fire, to Indra as the deity of the firmament, to the sun, to the moon, to the dawn, to night, and to various forms of divinities of a vague and undefined character, not necessarily connected with heavenly phenomena, but whose offices and stations are not satisfactorily specified, and are even unknown to the Hindus themselves. The religion of the Vedas was not idolatry; it had neither temples nor images. Its shrines were the halls or the court-yards of the dwellings of the worshippers, and its rude altars blazed with burnt offerings to elements, whose ideal impersonations or presiding spirits were indeed invoked to be present at the ceremony, and requested to accept the oblations either for themselves or for the gods universally, but who were never typified by wood or stone, or by any forms more real than the shadowy creations of superstitious awe and religious veneration. But though not idolatrous, the faith was polytheistic, and actual adoration was divided among a very considerable number and variety of imaginary beings.

Count Björnstjerna affirms that the sacred volume begins with these words, "that there is only one God, Brahma, omnipotent, eternal, omnipresent, the great soul of whom all other gods are but parts." The first stanza of the Rig-veda is in Rosen's version, Agnim (Ignem) celebro antistitem, sacrificii divinum sacerdotem, vocatorem, thesauris ditissimun. The first phrases of the Yajur are, "I cut thee, branch of the Palasa tree, for the sake of obtaining rain. I make thee straight (1). Do ye, ye calves, go with your mothers, to pasture (2). May the resplendent sun direct you to what is best for you (3)." The opening verse of the Sama Veda is, "Come, oh Agni (Fire), to the banquet of him who celebrates thy praise, to forward his offering. Herald (of the gods) sit down on the sacred grass;" and

the Atharva begins, "May the rivers water the sacrifice and the winds blow over it, may holy hymns secure its prosperity as I offer oblation with flowing butter." Now, none of these are at all like the passage which the Count has cited as the beginning of the sacred volume, and it is clear, therefore, that either a different work must have opened with such a commencement, or that no such initiatory passage occurs. He has not specified his authority for the passage. It is no doubt a genuine citation, but it may not have been taken from a very authentic source, unless it be translated from some other original than that which is here ascribed to it; it is most unlikely that any such dogma should be found in any part of the practical portion of the Vedas, in the hymns and prayers which were dictated by the Hindu religion in its most pure, simple, and primitive condition.

In another professed citation from the Vedas, we are able to discover the authority which the author has followed. The Vedas, he says, express themselves in the following manner:— "The angels assembled around the throne of the Almighty, and asked with submissiveness who he himself were; he then answered, Were there another than I, I should describe myself through him. I have been from eternity and shall remain to eternity; I am the first cause of all that exists in the east and west, and north and south, above and below; I am older than all the kings of kings, I am the truth, I am the spirit of the creation, the creator himself; I am knowledge, and purity, and light, I am almighty:" and the Count concludes; "these truly sublime ideas cannot fail to convince us that the Vedas recognise one only God, who is almighty, infinite, eternal, self-existent, the light and lord of the universe." His authority for this conclusion is not mentioned, but we have found it to be the "Oupnekhat," or Theologia Indica, Anquetil du Perron's Latin translation of a Persian translation of the Upanishads, made by order of Dara Shekoh, the son of Shahjehan and elder brother of Aurangzeb. In his second volume, p. 12, he gives a version of the Atharva Sára Upanishad, which begins "Oi Fereshtehah in behescht ante Roudr, id est, perientem (destructam) facientem omnem existentiam, cum ivissent et humilem submissionem eum loco attulissent, petierunt quod; Vos, qui estis? Roudr dixit, Si secundus meus (mei) sit, ego dicam quod ego quis sum, semper fui, et semper existo, et semper sum futurus; and the text proceeds with details from which those cited by the author are translated, or they may have been taken from a French version of the same publication. This is not very good authority. The text is evidently interlarded with Mohammedan ideas, as the words themselves declare, Ferishtaha and behisht being Persian words, implying "angels

and heaven." Still we may grant that for all essential purposes the text is a sufficient guide, but what is the authority of the Atharva Sára, and how far are the Upanishads the Veda? To the first we may answer that the Atharva Sára is at best of equivocal authenticity, and that the character it ascribes to Rudra, or the identification of an individual form of Siva with the One Supreme, is indicative of a later date and sectarial origin. The connexion between the Upanishads and the Vedas we shall presently speak of, disposing in the first place of the second division of these works—the Brahmanas.

We scarcely know yet what is meant by this term. The Brahmans themselves are chary of a definition, and are content to say that all that is not Mantra is Brahmana. Such of them as have been translated, partake of the same nature as the Mantras, being hymns and prayers, and are addressed to the same divinities, but they are of a less simple and patriarchal style, and are devised for rites more solemn and imposing than domestic worship, such as the sacrifices of animals, horses, or men, real or typical, by princes and sovereigns. Their style is more elevated, and they begin to indulge in a strain of mysticism in which it is not impossible they may contain the germ of later metaphysical speculation. In a still more general sense a Brahmana is practical, directing religious observances, teaching the purpose, time, and manner of performing them, indicating the prayers to be employed, and elucidating their import. In none of these respects do they answer exactly to our author's definition of them, as "religious precepts and theological arguments."

Still less applicable is the character he has given of the Upanishads, as abstracts of the Mantras and Brahmanas; they have nothing in common with the former, little except obscurity with the latter. They are wholly mystical and speculative, being short treatises on the nature of matter and spirit, of man and of God. There are usually enumerated fifty-one Upanishads. They are evidently of various eras, and some of them are most probably of no very remote date. The most celebrated are, however, no doubt of an antiquity inferior only to the secondary period of the Vedas, that of the Brahmanas, or to the collection of the Mantras in a systematized form. The Persian translation comprehends the whole fifty-one, and consequently so does the translation of M. Du Perron, but, as above remarked, they have undergone considerable modification in this double transfer. One or two are translated by Mr. Colebrooke, and several others by Rammohun Roy; we are therefore competent to form an opinion of their character, although not to pronounce definitively on what all of them do or do not contain. It is to them, however, that the

monotheism or rather the pantheism attributed to the Vedas is to be traced, and this very circumstance is a proof of their subsequent and independent origin. Worship precedes philosophy. Prayer and praise, the utterance of wants, and acknowledgment of their being supplied, are the natural language of man in the earliest stages of civilization, before he considers very nicely the nature of the supernatural beings to whom his thanks and supplications are addressed. It is only when the national belief obtains a degree of consistency, that some "from the rest retired," begin to meditate on their being's end, and aim; to distinguish between material and immaterial substance, and to look for a first cause and ruler of the universe. These speculative views gave rise to the Upanishads, and as far as they may be considered as a part of the Vedas, the Vedas may be said to inculcate monotheism, but they are rather supplementary to the Vedas than an integral portion of them, and constitute the second or third stage in the history of Hindu belief. In no respects can they be considered as abstracts of the older and practical works. Nor is it correct to say, even of the Upanishads, that their style is metaphorical, although Rammohun Roy be apparently the authority for this characteristic of the language of the Vedas. It is often obscure and mystical, but does not deal largely in metaphor. Still less is this true of the language of the Brahmanas, and, as of the Mantras although not destitute of poetry, it is exceedingly primitive and simple.

Recurring to the account given by our author of the history of the Vedas, we have to notice the somewhat startling announcement, that Manu was a commentator on those works, and that he considerably altered their contents. The Hindus invariably regard the laws of Manu as being in accordance with the doctrines of the Vedas, and this appears to be the case as far as their purposes are the same. From the time, however, of Sir William Jones's translation of the institutes of Manu, we have been aware that they are designed to regulate the civil and social conditions of the Hindus, and have little to do with the system of religious practice or belief, except as they prescribe the especial duties of the Hindus of the first three castes at various periods of life, and in different relations of society; certainly the laws of Manu are not intended nor calculated to illustrate the prayers and hymns of the four Vedas.

With respect to the deviation from the doctrines of the Vedas, with which Manu is charged, we are told that he proceeds from other views than those of the Vedas respecting the Almighty and the creation of the world; that the Vedas say nothing on the subject of caste, and are equally silent on that of the metem-

psychosis, and that consequently Manu is to be considered as the institutor of the distinction, and the inventor of the doctrine, positions which are unquestionably erroneous.

How far the social institutions of the Hindus or their metaphysical speculations may be discovered in the Mantras and Brahmanas remains to be determined, although in what has been translated there are indications which would warrant the inference that the social arrangement prevailed even when the Mantras were composed, and that the metempsychosis was not unknown. All doubt on the subject disappears when we come to the Upanishads; and these, as we have seen, the Count denominates abstracts of the other portions of the Vedas, and therefore in substance the same. Had he turned over a few pages of Rammohun Roy's small volume, he would soon have found that the notions of Manu are those of the Vedas, in as far as those are expressed by the Upanishads. Thus in the Moondak, "the superior kind of knowledge is that through which absorption into the Supreme Being may be obtained. The Supreme Being is beyond the apprehension of the senses; he is everlasting, all prevailing, omnipresent, unchangeable, and it is he whom wise men consider as the origin of the universe." These are the very terms in which Manu speaks of the self-existent Being from whom the universe proceeded.

In the same Upanishad we have the following explicit assertion of the doctrine of transmigration. "They who depend for emancipation on ceremonial rites, having enjoyed the consequence of such rites on the summit of heaven, transmigrate in the human form or in that of inferior animals or plants." So in the Kath Upanishad, "some of those who are ignorant (of the unity of spirit), enter after death the wombs of females to appear in the animal shape, while others assume the form of trees, according to their conduct and knowledge during their lives." There can be no doubt, therefore, that the Upanishads of the Vedas are familiar with the doctrine of the metempsychosis.

There is little occasion in the Vedas to allude to the distinction of castes, but the Brahman is particularized in almost every prayer or hymn. The Kshetriya or regal caste is also frequently mentioned, and the Vaisya and Sudra are not unnoticed, so are the distinctions of the Asramas or orders of the three first castes, as in the Moondak Upanishad. "Mendicants and hermits as well as householders, possessing wisdom and practising austerities, ascend to the highest heaven." It is clear, therefore, that the origin of these notions has been somewhat inconsiderately and unauthorizedly ascribed to Manu.

The account given of the actual distinctions of the followers of

the Brahmanical religion is equally inaccurate. They are distributed, it is said, among three branches, termed Vedantism, Vishnuism, and Saivism. Of the first it is affirmed that Brahma is the object, but it is added, that there is but one temple dedicated to this doctrine in which he is worshipped alone. We doubt if there is one temple even in which worship is offered to Brahmá, and certainly there is no temple dedicated to Vedantism. It is in fact a system of philosophy especially opposed to rites, inculcating spiritual knowledge by penance and meditation, and discountenancing ceremonial observances as productive of only temporary good. The object of knowledge is Brahm, not Brahmá; the universal Supreme Spirit, the First Cause of all, not Brahmá, the agent in material creation, the personified creative faculty. The Count has evidently been misled by the similarity of the name, and confounded two very different things. Brahmá, to whom alone worship may be, although it now never is addressed, has nothing in common with Vedantism.

The notices which follow of the worship of Vishnu and Siva are more correct, but they are very far from affording a complete picture of the diversities which exist. If the author had referred to the copious accounts of existing Hindu sects, published in the sixteenth and seventeenth volumes of the Asiatic Researches, he would have learned that there are at least twenty varieties of the worship of Vishnu, and half that number of the worship of Siva, besides a number of modifications of practice and opinion differing from both, with which he is evidently unacquainted. Most of these are of recent and well known origin, and their ready multiplication and extensive popularity, satisfactorily show that Hindu opinion is not the stubborn principle which it has been represented to be, and encourage us to hope, that in the fulness of time it will yield to the persuasive influence of light and truth.

Of the different schools of Hindu philosophy we have little except the names, and those strangely misrepresented. The translator and printer are here, however, probably more in fault than the author. They are said to be the elder Mimansa, the younger Mimansa or Vedanta, the logical school or Nijaya, the atomic theory of Canade (Canada), the atheistic school of Kapila, and the theistic of Pantanjali (Patanjali). It is remarked of the two last, that they are rather pantheistic than either atheistic or theistic: "they suppose that God and the world are the same; that spirit and matter are one; and that God is all, and all is God." Unfortunately this is wrongly attributed. It had been correct if it had been affirmed of the younger Mimansa or Vedanta school, but it is the reverse of the doctrines of Kapila and Patanjali.

The different philosophical systems of the Hindus, with exception of the elder Mimansa, which stops at the consequences of ceremonial observances, have one common object,—the assertion of transmigration through living forms, the final emancipation of the soul from corporeal bondage, and its escape from bodily pain and degradation. This consummation they make to depend upon the acquirement of true wisdom,—knowledge by the soul of its nature and end,—but they do not agree exactly as to its final destination. The consideration of this involves the recognition of one of two principles: of spirit alone, or of matter as well as spirit; and the question, how far individuality may be predicated of the latter as one supreme origin and end of all things. In one sense, all the philosophical schools may be termed atheistical, as attributes are by all withheld from the supreme soul, and neither in the creation nor in the government of the universe is any active interposition exercised. In this they have departed from the doctrines of some of the Upanishads, which seem to be the foundation of most of the philosophy; for they, in speaking of spirit anterior to creation, ascribe to it "will," the exertion of which led to the evolution of the world and of man,—as in the text, "THAT (Spirit) was alone, and willed to be many." Thence came into existence the perceptible creation, which once extant, was left to the guidance of inferior creatures, the gods of the ordinary mythology: so far, therefore, is God admitted as "willing" things to be, but there his function terminates, and the notion of one supreme, presiding, all-directing, all-judging Providence, is foreign to every system of Hindu philosophy.

The secondary Mimansa or Vedanta professes to derive its doctrines of the unity of spirit from the Vedas, being, as the name implies, the end or scope of those authorities. By the Vedas, however, must be understood the Upanishads: with perhaps a few obscure texts of the Brahmanas: the speculations of the Vedanta derive no countenance from the ritual. The Vedánta, maintaining the doctrine of unity, or of one principle alone, is reduced to the necessity of either considering matter and spirit to be the same, or of getting quit of the former. It has chosen the latter alternative, and holds that matter has no existence independent of our ideas, and that all material substance is unreal or illusory. This is what is meant by Máyá, or delusion, and our author, therefore, is inaccurate when, after specifying a few of the Vedanta tenets, he proceeds: "the next of the philosophical systems of India which deserves to be mentioned, if on no other account, from the number of its adherents, is the so-termed system of Máyá or Illusion." As far as Máyá constitutes an essential element in any system, it is the same thing with the Vedanta.

It is to this school also that the term pantheistic is most appropriate; for neither the Sankhya nor the Yoga system, or as they are here both called, Sankia, supposes that "God and the world are one, that spirit and matter are one, or that God is all and all is God." This is transcendental Vedantism; the Sankhya and Yoga are its antagonist systems; both maintaining the dualistic doctrine, and asserting the co-eternal and independent existence of both matter and spirit. The latter, the Yoga school, affirms the existence of "God as a soul or spirit distinct from other souls, unaffected by the ills with which they are beset, unconcerned with good or bad deeds and their consequences, and with fancies or passing thoughts. In him is the utmost omniscience. He is the instructor of the earliest beings that have a beginning (the deities of mythology); himself infinite, unlimited by time." Kapila, the teacher of the Sankhya, "on the other hand, denies an Iswara, ruler of the world by volition; alleging that there is no proof of God's existence, which is unperceived by the senses, not inferred from reason, nor yet revealed." We are afraid, therefore, that the author has omitted to peruse Mr. Colebrooke's essays on the different systems of Hindu philosophy, and he must certainly be unacquainted with the translation of the Sánkhya Karika, published by the Translation Fund, or he would never have called the Sánkhya doctrine, pantheism.

"The cosmogony of the Hindoos is contained not alone in the Vedas and in the Vedanta, but also in the Codex of Manu." That any account of the creation of the world is found in the Vedas is very unlikely, unless we restrict the term to the Upanishads, and even in them we have only allusions to the event, not any detailed description. The subject is not peculiar to the Vedanta, but enters necessarily into all the philosophical systems which pretend to investigate the origin of spiritual and material existence. The first book of Manu does contain a system of cosmogony, but the account is somewhat vague and obscure, owing in part to its eclectic character, and to its having mixed together fragmentary portions of incompatible systems, and added particulars derived from the Upanishads, and probably from tradition. Although, therefore, not an original or consistent account, it is the more deserving of attention as it apparently represents with sufficient precision current and popular belief.

It is, in the first place, dualistic, intimating, in concurrence with the Sankhya and Nyayikas, the eternity of matter; for though it is said that "THIS" (that is, the yet unformed universe) was dark, unperceived, not inferrible, indefinable, incognizable, yet "IT WAS:" it was only, as it were, immersed in profound sleep; it existed in the shape of crude, undeveloped matter, or

Prakriti. The doctrine is not unsupported by the Upanishads, as in such texts as "This world was extant in the beginning." Sir William Jones has added from the commentator, This world existed only (in the first divine idea yet unextended, as if involved) in darkness; but this is a gloss of the Vedanta school, of the advocates of the principle of unity, and is wholly unauthorized by the letter and tenor of the text, which is evidently dualistic, and affirms the independent existence of matter before creation,—"without form," indeed, but not without existence. The translation of M. Des Longchamps, which Count Björnstjerna has preferred, is much less accurate—at least in its English dress—than that of Sir William Jones, and conveys equally wrong notions.

In the next stage of creation we have in Manu—following the texts, no doubt, of the Upanishads—the agency of a Creator: "The self-existent, the unperceived, making manifest the rudimental elements, of irresistible creative power, and dispelling the darkness, appeared."

The notion of a Creator is here something more than the supreme universal spirit of the Vedanta or any of the philosophical schools, and appears to have been the popular notion founded on texts of the Vedas, implying not only spirituality, but individuality and person: as the commentator on Manu observes, "of his own will he assumes body." Still the original texts are capable of a different interpretation, and admit of the Vedantic exposition of the unity of the Creator and the created: as it is said, "He is single, he becomes double;" "Brahma is that from which all are born, by which all live, and to which all return." Manu, however, clearly distinguishes the self-existent Swayambhu from the matter of the universe, and does not therefore exclusively follow the Vedanta school.

The description of the Self-born which follows in Manu is not incompatible with personal individuality, although, as usual, vague and capable of being variously explained: "He is apprehensible by the mind alone, subtile, invisible, eternal, inconceivable, composed of the universal elements (or one with elementary substance)." This latter attribute would seem to imply pantheism, identifying God and the created world, at least in the Vedanta sense of the ideality of the latter; but that were incompatible with what has preceded, and the contradiction is one of the proofs of the eclectic character of the text, and the manner in which conflicting tenets have been culled and confounded together.

The elemental character of the Self-born has been probably a popular notion, and is adopted to account for what follows, which is entirely of a popular character, and is not authorized by any philosophical system: "He being desirous of creating creatures,

having meditated, emitted from his own body, in the first place, water and scattered in it a seed." Here we have person and material existence clearly predicated of the Self-born, and the origin of the first element,—not an illusory, ideal element, but *bonâ fide* water, is ascribed to him: an origin, it may be marked, which is irreconcilable with the previous assertion that crude matter co-existed; a contradiction which the dualistic philosophy avoids, by assigning the development of water and other elements in this rudimental state, not to spirit, but to Prakriti, to nature, or crude matter, through the influence of spirit.

The seed or germ thus abandoned or cast in the waters, is said by the Vedanta to be a metaphorical expression for the divine or spiritual energy, but this is not the doctrine of Manu; and the text now evidently departs from all abstractions, and expresses palpable and popular notions, based no doubt upon the oracular phraseology of the Upanishads, but not altogether consistent with their interpretation by any of the philosophical schools. The seed becomes a golden egg, and in that egg is produced, from the inscrutable First Cause of all, Brahmá, the active author of all the forms of created things, the immediate Creator of the existent universe. In respect to the mundane egg, the Hindu notion corresponds with one very common among the ancient nations of the East, but whether it be among the archaic fictions of the Hindus is very questionable. It is older than Manu, if our impression of the eclectic character of his code be correct, but whether it be as ancient as the Vedas, or even as the Upanishads, has yet to be ascertained.

We shall not follow our author in his observations upon the traditions of the Deluge which prevailed among the nations of the ancient world, and which are common to the Hindus. He has cited not very correctly one only of the accounts, and that taken from a work of modern date, the Bhagavat Purana; but the same, the legend of Satyavrata, who was preserved during a universal flood in a boat constructed by him by command of Vishnu, and piloted by the god in the form of the Matsya or fish avatar, is to be found in other and older books, as, for instance, in the Mahabharata. The other two of the three first avatars, the Tortoise and the Boar,—the former upholding the mountain with which the ocean was churned, and the latter raising up the earth from beneath the waters,—evidently refer to the same event. But then comes the question, what is the age of the avatars? No details respecting them have yet been found in either portion of the Vedas, not even in the Upanishads, and the allusions hitherto met with are few and doubtful. The Rig-Veda, for instance, refers

to the divinity of the "Three Steps," which not improbably alludes to the fourth avatar of Vishnu as the Vámana or Dwarf, who, on having three paces of space granted him by Bali, whose pride he had descended to humble, bestrode earth and heaven, and refrained from the third step, which would not have left Bali even sovereignty in Hell; at the same time the appearance of Vishnu at all in the Vedas is unfrequent, and the identity of the Vishnu of those works with the Vishnu of the Puranas so questionable, that it may be doubted if the epithet Trivikrama be not merely metaphorical, denoting a divinity paramount either over the three worlds or the three periods of time, and whether the epithet may not in fact have suggested the legend. These are among the many problems which remain to be resolved, before we can venture to affirm, of a variety of important details in the practices and belief of the Hindus, that they are of an ancient date and of unborrowed origin.

We shall leave to geologists the objections Count Björnstjerna urges against Cuvier's theory of the deluge, and to metaphysicians his adoption of the Sankhya doctrine that matter is immortal like spirit; our business has been exclusively with his account of the religious and philosophical notions of the Hindus, and we are sorry that we cannot bestow upon the manner in which he has performed his task more unqualified commendation. We had no reason to expect from the author any original information, but we had a right to demand the accurate communication of all that was authentic and recent, the sources of which are abundant and accessible, and of the highest authority. It is clear, however, that he has turned aside from the well-head to wade in shallow and muddy channels, and deserting the only guides competent to lead him through the mazes of his subject, he has followed others imperfectly masters of the clue, and has lost his way on the very threshold of the labyrinth. Making little or no use of Colebrooke's essays on the Vedas and philosophical systems, or of the translations of the Rig and Sama-vedas, of the Upanishads, of the Sánkhya Karika, of the Bhagavat and Vishnu Puranas, all of them incontestable authorities, he has followed such half-informed and undiscriminating writers as the compiler of the "Mythologie des Hindous," or such crude and second-hand translations as the "Oupnekhat" of Du Perron.

There was a time when such want of discrimination would have been excusable, but it can no longer be extenuated; as even if the abundant information furnished through the English language be not readily available to a native of the continent, there is no lack of correct information on Hindu subjects, both original and translated, in the languages of France and Germany, in the

writings of Burnouf, Lassen, and Schlegel, and of a host of meritorious cultivators of the languages and literature of India.

At the same time we are willing to acknowledge, that although we are now in possession of a great mass of materials for constructing a conclusive scheme of Hinduism as it now is, and as it has been for many centuries, we are not yet provided sufficiently with the means of tracing it to its source, or of acquiring accurate knowledge of its pristine and archaic condition: we are not yet prepared for the investigation. The task cannot be safely undertaken until we have before us all the most important texts of the Vedas, and trustworthy translations of them. Something, as we have had occasion to remark, has been contributed towards the accomplishment of this object, but not much; something more is in progress, but it is tardy. The untimely death of Dr. Rosen cut short the publication of the Rig-veda, and the portion of the Sama-veda published by Mr. Stevenson is of limited extent. A useful institution, the Oriental Text Society, has engaged to print the entire texts of the Rig-veda and Yajur-veda, and two of our most eminent Sanscrit scholars, Professor Wilson and Dr. Mill, are pledged to edit them, and propose to add translations. The work is laborious and requires time, and as the means of the Text Society are, we believe, but limited, a considerable interval is likely to elapse before either of these important works can be consulted by those who seek to become acquainted either with the early religion of the Hindus or the history of opinion in general. Our knowledge of the religion and philosophy of the ancient world must necessarily be imperfect and inaccurate, until we have ascertained the precise notions which either originated in India, or flowing thither from other parts of the East, there received a new development and a cumulative impulse, the consequences of which are still in active operation among so many millions of the human race, obstacles to their elevation in moral dignity and fatal to their hopes of future happiness. It were for the credit of Great Britain—we may venture to think it is her duty, interwoven as India now is with her political prosperity—to take the lead in tearing away the veil that shrouds the ancient form of the Hindu faith, secure that the more thoroughly it is known, even by the Hindus themselves, the more sensibly will they feel the want of another and a better. As a matter of enlightened curiosity also, it becomes a great government to preserve the relics of the old world: we need not rebuild its decaying shrines, but we may worthily protect them from dilapidation, and maintain them as interesting and not uninstructive records of the past.

ART. III.—*Ouvrages inédits d'Abélard, pour servir à l'histoire de la philosophie scholastique en France ; publiés par* M. VICTOR COUSIN. 4to. Paris, 1836, *forming part of the* "*Collection de Documents inédits sur l'Histoire de France, publiés par ordre du Roi, et par les soins du Ministre de l'instruction publique.*"

Lettres d'Abailard et d'Héloise, traduites sur les manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Royale, par E. ODDEUL ; *précédés d'un Essai Historique, par* M. & MME. GUIZOT. *Edition illustrée par J. Gigoux.* Paris, 1839.

WITH the exception of St. Bernard, Peter Abelard is the most remarkable personage in the literary history of the twelfth century. The former may be considered as representing the conservative and orthodox spirit of his age, the latter may be regarded as the type of its liberalism and speculative rationalism. Without reference to their moral qualities, and viewing them only in an intellectual aspect, Abelard[1] is perhaps the more striking character of the two. The glowing eloquence indeed of the abbot of Clairvaux, and the immense influence which he had obtained throughout Christendom, so overpowered Abelard in the dispute which brought these rivals into collision, that he has not emerged from the shade into which he was then condemned, nor is it to be expected, or indeed desired, that he will ever assume that rank in the literary history of Europe, to which if his talents and acquirements were alone regarded, he might appear to be so justly entitled.

Independent of the moral lessons which the history of Abelard teaches us, his biography is both interesting and instructive. The names of few writers of that *seculum obscurum*, the twelfth century, are better known than his ; but his true claims to popularity are not always rightly understood. They do not rest, as they are generally supposed to do, upon his unfortunate and disgraceful connexion with Heloise. More incident is associated with his history than with any other ecclesiastic with whom we are acquainted. Abelard was not only an elegant poet and skilful musician, but he was one of the most popular and successful

[1] We do not feel inclined to disturb the orthography or pronunciation which usage has sanctioned on the authority of Pope's line,

"All is not heaven's while Abelard has part."

The more correct form, however, is Abēlard.

teachers whom France, or perhaps modern Europe, has ever produced. As a philosopher he moderated in the great dispute of his age; he rejected both Realism and Nominalism, and created an intermediate system named Conceptualism. In Theology he founded the school known by the name of Rationalism. His speculations gave occasion for the holding of two councils, those of Soissons and Sens; and although the eloquence and authority of St. Bernard were called into exercise for their suppression, these opinions survived in the person of the celebrated Arnold of Brescia, and a host of other admirers, and have descended to our own generation.

As might be expected from these circumstances, Abelard has had warm friends and bitter enemies. By the latter he is represented as a dangerous and a rash theorist, a man whose wild philosophy, if carried out, would undermine the everlasting truths of revelation. His character, according to their estimate, is made up of pride, arrogance, insubordination, contempt of constituted authority, treachery, and dissoluteness. His advocates tell us, on the other hand, that his only object was to systematise theology, and to give to that science greater precision and accuracy than it had hitherto attained; and if in this attempt he opposed the narrow prejudices of the ecclesiastics of the age in which he lived, it surely is our duty to sympathise rather with his clear-sightedness than their bigotry. Uninfluenced by prejudice or by theory, it shall be our object in the following pages to give a sketch of the life of this extraordinary individual, derived for the most part from his own writings, and illustrated by contemporaneous authorities, and we shall examine as they arise such questions as may enable us to form a fair and a candid estimate of his opinions and character.

Peter Abelard, the eldest son of Berenger and Lucy, was born in the year 1079, at Paletz[2], or Palais, a small town situated a few miles to the east of Nantz. His father, although a soldier, was a man of cultivated mind and refined taste, and he took care that his sons should be instructed not only in arms, but also in literature. Abelard's predilection for study soon exhibited itself, and deserting the court of Mars, to use his own expression, he took refuge in the bosom of Minerva. His favourite study was

[2] Hence the name of Palatinus Peripateticus given to him by our countryman John of Salisbury, (see his Metalogicus, pp. 14, 84, 129, 147, 156,) an appellation which has puzzled several well-informed writers upon literary history, among the rest our own Bishop Tanner, (see his Bibl. Brit. p. 6,) under the article "Adamus Anglicus." This is the more surprising, as in the same work, lib. ii. cap. xvii. p. 99, John of Salisbury writes thus, "In hac opinione deprehensus est Peripateticus Palatinus Abelardus noster, qui multos reliquit et adhuc aliquos habet professionis hujus sectatores."

logic, its subtleties were calculated to engage a mind like his, naturally astute rather than profound, and his vanity led him to study a science which enabled a defeated disputant to cover his retreat when overpowered in argument. But it was his misfortune to be placed at this early period of his life under the tuition of a master whose theological opinions were decidedly heterodox. Roscelin[3], a canon of Compeigne, had speculated in such an unguarded manner upon the nature of the Trinity, as to end by affirming that the Three Persons in the Godhead were really and essentially distinct, and that to assert there were three Gods was not an heretical expression, although it was unusual[4]. These blasphemous doctrines were warmly opposed by Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, and were condemned by the Council of Soissons in A. D. 1092; but notwithstanding these censures, they were still entertained by their originator. After a banishment into England, which gave him the opportunity of promulgating his obnoxious doctrines at Oxford, he returned into France, and towards the conclusion of his life settled in that district of which both he and Abelard were natives. The young logician was thus brought into contact with the veteran heretic, and from such an instructor it would appear that Abelard imbibed those unsettled opinions, from the influence of which he could never afterwards totally free himself.

Abelard's apologists, however, are anxious to save him from the obloquy of having been educated in such a school; and observing that in "the History of his Calamities," he does not mention Roscelin among his instructors, they have ventured to assert that no direct communication existed between these parties. But the statement which we have made rests upon evidence which cannot be shaken. Otho of Frisingen[5], the contemporary and apologist of Abelard, tells us, that he derived his earliest instructions from Roscelin, and in this he is followed by Aventine[6]; and the question is set at rest for ever by Abelard himself, who refers to the doctrines of his master Roscelin, from which however he was compelled to dissent[7].

Under this instructor, Abelard made considerable progress in learning. Logic, however, was his darling study, his ruling taste, his supreme talent; in him the logician was the father of the theologian; logic has conferred upon him all the reputation

[3] Hist. Lit. de la France, ix. 358.

[4] S. Anselmi Opera, pp. 41, 43, 357, edit. 1721.

[5] De Gestis Frederici, lib. i. cap. 47, ap. Murat. Script. Rerum Ital. tom. vi. col. 678.

[6] Annales Boiorum, lib. vi. A.D. 1137.

[7] P. Abæl. Dialectica, p. 471, ed. Cousin; see also the Introduction to that volume, p. 40.

which he enjoys, and brought upon him all the discredit under which he labours; to it he is indebted for all the splendour of his youth, and all the gloom which hangs over the history of his maturer years[8]. Anxious to exhibit the proficiency which he had made in this polemical study, he wandered from province to province, visiting each school of literary gladiatorship as he went along, and as might have been expected, he soon found himself in Paris.

Paris was at this time the most learned city in Europe. In the affected phraseology of the period it was styled Cariath-sepher[9], which being interpreted means, the City of the Book. About the middle of the twelfth century, the number of students was so great that they could with difficulty find accommodation within its walls, and they are said to have been even more numerous than the citizens[1]. The see of Rome itself did not hesitate to consult the University when doubts pressed, as they sometimes did, upon the minds of its infallible Pontiffs. Pope Innocent the Third applied to Peter Lombard, bishop of Paris, for his opinion upon the knotty question of Fraternal Correption[2]. The importance of its various schools may be gathered from merely naming a few of Abelard's contemporaries, who there taught, or were there educated. William de Campellis, one of his earliest tutors there, was soon afterwards promoted to the see of Chalons[3]. Bandré, archbishop of Dol[4]; Ulger, bishop of Angers[5]; Alberic of Rheims, archbishop of Bourges[6]; Geoffrey de Oratorio, archbishop of Bourdeaux[7]; Walter de Mortagne, bishop of Laon[8]; Peter Lombard and Maurice de Sulli, bishops of Paris[9]; all of whom were the contemporaries of Abelard, had studied in the University of Paris, or in some of the schools connected with it. Michael de Corbeil, dean of St. Denys, then celebrated for the education which it gave, after having refused the patriarchate of Jerusalem[1], was consecrated archbishop of Sens. Bernard de Moellan, bishop of Kimper[2], had there taught philosophy[3]. Gilbert Porretanus, another pro-

[8] He was surnamed "Dialecticus," see J. Thomasii Dissertat. de Doctoribus Scholasticis Latinis, edit. 1676, § viii.

[9] Phil. Abbatis Bonæ-Spei Epist. iii. ad Hervardum, quoted by Launoy, Opp. tom. iv. par. i. p. 70, edit. Colon. 1732.

[1] Pezii Anecdot. tom. v. par. i. p. 427.

[2] Launoy, Opp. iv. i. 76.

[3] Gallica Christiana, ii. 505, edit. 1656.

[4] Id. ii. 566.

[5] Id. ii. 132.

[6] Id. i. 167.

[7] Id. i. 210.

[8] Id. ii. 622.

[9] Id. i. 435, 436.

[1] Art. de Veref. les Dates, i. 299, edit. fol.

[2] Gall. Christ. ii. 551.

[3] Hist. Lit. de la France, ix. 69.

fessor, was made bishop of Poitiers[4]. It would be tedious were we to reckon up the names of our own countrymen who crossed the Channel in order to complete their education at Paris; we shall satisfy ourselves with mentioning some of those more distinguished Englishmen who became teachers of logic, philosophy, or theology, within the French capital. Adam de Parvo Ponte, canon of St. Denys, and lecturer there, became bishop of St. Asaph[5]. Robert de Bethune, bishop of Hereford, had taught philosophy at Paris in conjunction with his brother Godfrey[6]. His successor in his chair as well as his see, was Robert de Melun[7]. Baldwin, successively abbot of Ford, bishop of Worcester, and archbishop of Canterbury, wrote a treatise upon mythology for the use of his Parisian scholars[8]. Gilbert, surnamed Universalis, from the extent of his learning, another professor there, was afterwards consecrated bishop of London[9]. Robert Pullus, another countryman of our own, attained such reputation by his lectures, that a cardinal's hat was bestowed upon him, and he is said to be the first Englishman who attained that distinction[1]. And the list may be closed with the name of Nicholas Breakspere, who before ascending the papal throne as Adrian the Fourth, had first studied and then taught in the monastery of St. Victor[2].

The chief attraction of the University of Paris when Abelard first visited it, was the teaching of the celebrated William de Campellis. He received Abelard with kindness, but ere long he discovered that instead of having gained a pupil he had met with a rival. The new student set himself to refute some of his teacher's opinions; he frequently reasoned against him openly, and according to his own statement was generally the victor in these disputations. Here we have the first instance of that annoyance and self-sufficiency which attended him through his whole life[3], and we can scarce be surprised to find that from this period he dates the commencement of his misfortunes. Master and scholar could not long continue together upon such a footing, and Abelard settled at Melun, then one of the royal residences, for the purpose

[4] Gall. Christ. ii. 886.
[5] Godwin de Præsulibus Angliæ, p. 634, edit. Richardson.
[6] Anglia Sacra, ii. 300.
[7] Tanner's Biblioth. p. 521.
[8] Hist. Lit. de la France, ix. 166.
[9] Id. 71. 90.
[1] Cave, Hist. Lit. ii. 223.
[2] Hist. Lit. de la France, ix. 116.
[3] Otho of Frisingen, Abelard's friend, although generally inclined to view him in a favourable light, describes him as a man "tam arrogans suoque tantum ingenio confidens, ut vix ad audiendos magistros ab altitudine mentis suæ humiliatus descenderet." De Gestis Frid. i. 47.

of opening a school for philosophy. The result equalled his most sanguine expectations; scholars flocked to him from all quarters; and elated with his success, he resolved to return to Corbeil, near Paris, with the intention of pushing his late master to extremities. While preparing for the renewal of these hostilities, a severe malady, occasioned by intense application to study, compelled him to return to his native air, and to abandon his literary occupations.

When he again visited Paris, after an advance of some years, he was astonished to find that William de Campellis, his former master, had assumed the habit of a canon regular, and was occupied in teaching in the monastery of St. Victor. He ascribes this change to no better motive than the craving for ecclesiastical preferment, and remarks that ere long it was gratified by the attainment of a bishopric. A reconciliation followed, and then, as might have been expected, another quarrel, in which Abelard assures us that he was again victorious. The individual who had succeeded William de Campellis, when he relinquished the schools at Paris for the monastery of St. Victor, resigned this appointment in favour of our young philosopher, and descended from the rank of a teacher to that of a pupil. These statements rest upon Abelard's own authority, and we have no means of testing their accuracy. A contemporary author, however, mentions an incident which should not be here omitted. In the midst of these triumphs, which Abelard assures us he was gaining over a veteran logician, we have good evidence for believing that he sustained a signal defeat from a disputant of his own standing. A youth named Gorwin, afterwards abbot of Auchin, in Flanders, but at that time a student in Paris, shocked at the novelties contained in the propositions advanced by Abelard, challenged him to a discussion, and defeated him[4]. No allusion to this incident is found in the autobiography, whence we have derived most of our information.

That document proceeds to mention various skirmishes between the followers of Abelard and those of William de Campellis; and a pitched battle between the leaders themselves was prevented only by the former being recalled home to arrange his domestic affairs, in consequence of his mother having renounced the world and adopted the monastic profession, thus following the example of her husband Berenger. The attention of the latter was entirely engrossed by his promotion to the bishopric of Chalons sur Marne, which occurred at the same time; and Abelard was left without a rival.

[4] Mabill. Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, lib. lxxii. § 56.

He was not long however in making one, and the circumstances which gave rise to his new disputes, afford another instance of the undisciplined character of his mind. Hitherto he had studied only logic and philosophy; he now wished to make himself acquainted with theology, and for that object he entered the schools of Anselm of Laudun. Anselm's reputation was high, and deservedly so. During the forty years he taught theology he was regarded as the light and the oracle of the Latin Church; he was styled the Doctor of Doctors; and by his instructions were formed the great theologians, not only of France, but of England, Italy, and Germany[5]. In the same sentence in which Abelard tells us that his master was the most celebrated divine of his day, he speaks of him in terms the most disparaging and contemptuous[6]. "This old man," says he, "had gained his reputation rather from unopposed concession than from merit. If you came to consult him upon any doubtful question, you departed more doubting than when you came. They who heard him lecture were astonished, not so they who questioned. He had a considerable flow of language, but the sense which lay under it was contemptible and devoid of reason. When he lit his fire he filled the house with smoke, but produced no light. He was a tree whose foliage promised great things to those who looked upon it from a distance; but when you drew near in search of fruit, you discovered that it was barren. I found upon a more intimate acquaintance, that this was the fig-tree which the Lord had pronounced accursed."

Extreme as these opinions were, Abelard took no pains to conceal them, and they speedily reached the ears of his instructor; but Anselm appears to have treated them with calm dignity, and to have let them pass unnoticed. When his fellow-students remonstrated with him, Abelard persisted in asserting that since Anselm professed only to expound the Scriptures from the writings of the Fathers, less advantage was to be gained from hearing his lectures than from the study of a good commentary. Advancing from one degree of presumption to another, he next affirmed that there was no difficulty in the exposition of Scripture, and he undertook to explain any passage, however obscure: with the intention of convincing him of the absurdity of this theory, his friends referred him to the commencement of the Book of Ezekiel, confessedly one of the most mysterious portions of the whole sacred volume; but nothing abashed, he declared his readi-

[5] Mabill. Annal. Ord. S. Benedict. lib. lxxii. § 55; Hist. Lit. de la France, xii. 91; Brucker, Hist. Philosophiæ, iii. 741, and the authorities there cited.

[6] Opp. p. 7.

ness to explain it, and invited them to attend his lecture on the morrow. In reply to their advice, that he should study the subject before compromising himself, he met them with an avowal which is worth noticing, as giving us an insight into the principle upon which many of his theological opinions were based. It was not his custom, he said, to regard experience, but talent[7]. When the morning came few attended his lecture, but those whose curiosity led them thither were so struck with the novelty and talent evinced in what they heard, that from that day there was a rapid increase in the number of his auditors. The jealousy of Anselm of Laudun was now roused, and it was not less bitter than that which had formerly been evinced by William de Campellis; a strong party headed by two of Anselm's scholars, Albericus and Lotulfus, was formed against the self-constituted professor, and he was again compelled to take refuge in his former retreat at Paris.

The success of his experiment as a teacher of divinity had been so flattering, that he resumed without delay his exposition of Ezekiel. He became, ere long, as celebrated in this department of literature, as he had been in logic or philosophy. A letter of condolence addressed to him when in the midst of his misfortunes, by Fulcho abbot of Deuil, thus dwells upon the reputation which he had attained at this period of his history. "It is not long," says this well-informed, though perhaps somewhat prejudiced correspondent, "since the full glory of this world shined upon you, and would not permit you to remember that you were liable to misfortune. Rome sent you her children to be educated, and by so doing admitted that you were more learned than herself. No length of journey, no lofty mountains, no deep valleys, no fear of robbers, prevented your scholars from hastening to you. The sea and the tempest did not frighten the youth of England, but despising all danger, no sooner did they hear where you were to be found than they flocked thither. Remote Bretagne sent you her heavy sons to be made wise. Fierce Anjou served you, for you had tamed her ferocity. The Pictavians, the Gascons, and the Irish: Normandy and Flanders, the German and the Swede, warmly praised your mental acuteness. I pass by all the inhabitants of Paris and the whole of France from one end to the other; all thirsted after your instruction, as if you were the only teacher in the world. Won by the brilliancy of your intellect, and the sweetness of your eloquence; the readiness of your diction, and the subtlety of your knowledge, they hastened to you as to the purest well of philosophy[8]."

[7] Indignatus autem respondi, non esse meæ consuetudinis per usum proficere, sed per ingenium. Opp. p. 8.

[8] Abæl. Opp. p. 218.

We have already mentioned that at this time Paris was eminent as a seat of learning; we are compelled to admit that it was not free from those vices which too often attend a highly cultivated state of society. According to the description of a contemporary writer, it contained within all that was calculated to excite the passions and to gratify them[9]. When we read of the University of Paris, and the students who attended it, we naturally imagine that a system of academical discipline similar to our own, or in some degree approaching to it, was there established. Such, however, was not the case. Teachers and students came and tarried, and departed with a degree of independence which to us is surprising. Professors were to be found wherever there was the greatest prospect of success, and scholars flocked after the most popular lecturers. The system of education too, which there prevailed, had not acquired any unity of purpose, any dependence of one part upon another, at the same time having reference to one end and to one object. Logic and philosophy, instead of being the handmaids to theology, were regarded as independent studies, and we read of men who were proficient in the former, while they were mere tyros in the latter[1]. The clergy themselves had fallen into a state of much degeneracy, and the more spiritual minded among them called loudly for a reformation. Abelard, probably a sufficient authority upon such matters, warmly censures their luxury, corruption, idleness, and dissipation[2]; and however much they might differ upon other subjects, in this he and St. Bernard were unanimous[3].

The picture which Abelard has drawn of his own mental condition at this period of his life, shows us that he was deficient in many of those qualifications which alone could enable him to pass in safety through the temptations by which he was surrounded. We have already had proofs of his pride and arrogance in reference to his instructors, but these now exhibited themselves in a new and a more dangerous direction. We cannot do better than give a paraphrase of his own words. "I was then so celebrated," says he, "and so pre-eminent in the graces of youth and beauty, that I did not fear a repulse from any woman whom I honoured with my love. I now thought myself the only living philosopher; and anticipating no further disquiet, from having lived most

[9] Pet. Allensis, lit. ix. ep. 10, Dach. Spicileg. xii. 362, 363. Marten. Anecdot. iii. 1714.

[1] John Stulicus was rejected from being Archbishop of Bourdeaux, because he was ignorant of theology though well skilled in profane literature. Hist. Lit. ix. 63.

[2] Opp. pp. 363, 364.

[3] See that portion of Mabillon's preface, where he treats "De Bernardi profectu in emendandis moribus clericorum, monachorum, et laicorum."

soberly, I began to give the reins to my passions; and the more progress I made in the study of philosophy or theology, the further did I in the impurity of my life recede from the character of a philosopher or a Christian. The grace of God vouchsafed to me, although I was unwilling to receive it, a remedy for the diseases of pride and dissoluteness under which I then laboured[4]." It is unnecessary to do more than hint at the unfortunate and disgraceful connexion which he now formed with his pupil Heloise, or the hideous revenge which her relations took upon her seducer, notwithstanding the attempt which he made to atone for his crime by marriage; we pass onwards to narrate the events which followed.

Degraded thus below the rank of manhood, Abelard's sufferings were those of the mind rather than the body. The condolences offered by his friends and pupils were intolerable. His present abasement was in proportion to his former elevation; he felt that it was God's hand which pressed so heavy upon him; he knew that he had entailed disgrace upon his relations, and that he could not venture to cross his threshold without being pointed at by the finger of scorn. In this frame of mind he saw one only haven of rest, a monastery; and influenced rather by shame than devotion[5], he took refuge within the walls of St. Denys. His ill-fated wife, disregarding the entreaties of her friends, at the same time became a nun at Argenteuil. But they both carried with them memories and feelings for which no monastery afforded any adequate consolation.

Scarce had Abelard recovered his former health and strength, ere his scholars requested that he would resume his lectures. He consented to do so, not however, as hitherto, from the love of worldly gain or reputation, but because he felt that God had given him a talent which must not be hidden in a napkin. The office of teacher did not afford sufficient scope for his awakened energies; he assumed the character of reformer. He discovered that the monks were of profane habits and unholy conversation, and that their abbot[6], so far from being a pattern of sobriety, was the most dissolute of the whole brotherhood. Frequently and vehemently, in public and in private, did he rebuke their misdeeds;

[4] Opp. pp. 9, 10.

[5] In tam misera me contritione positum confusio, fateor, pudoris, potius quam devotio conversionis ad monastichorum latibula claustrorum compulit. Opp. p. 18.

[6] The name of this ecclesiastic was Adam. Abelard's censures appear to have been unjust, for when accused to the king, he found a warm defender in Ivo Carnotensis, Ep. 196.

Suger in his Life of Ludovicus Grossus, styles him "bonæ memoriæ," and in the necrology he is entered as "piæ memoriæ." See Mabill. Annal. Ord. S. Bened. lib. lxxii. § iii.

and they on their part did not fail to resent the interference of this self-constituted monitor. It must have been a relief to both parties therefore, when, by the permission of the abbot, Abelard removed to a neighbouring cell, that he might more easily instruct the numerous scholars who flocked to his lectures. His success again provoked the hostility of his enemies. Headed by Albericus and Lotulfus, his former persecutors, they matured against him a more systematic and dangerous attack than any to which he had been yet exposed. He had hitherto been censured for his insubordination, his disregard to authority, his want of respect to his elders, his pride, arrogance, and assumption; but the charge now brought against him was, that he was a teacher of heresy.

Two distinct classes of theological reasoners then existed. The more numerous part of the clergy, anxious to make all subservient to the interests of the Church, was willing that her doctrines should be supported by argument as well as authority, without forgetting that in some instances, authority must be more powerful than argument. The other party, better logicians than theologians, although they were not influenced by any direct hostility to the Church, were inclined to follow reason wherever she led them; and where argument and authority appeared to clash, they would, if consistent, have sacrificed the latter to the former. They wished to discuss and to demonstrate the articles of the Christian faith upon the principles of scholastic reasoning, and to apply to all their own system of philosophy. As we have already remarked, Abelard was the representative of the rationalists, as St. Bernard was of their opponents.

We must not imagine, however, that Abelard was the originator of these principles, although they were advocated and matured by him, and he contributed much to their development and extension. We have already seen that he had imbibed them from his master Roscelin; and there were others, his contemporaries, whose orthodoxy was more than questionable. Gilbert Porretanus, bishop of Poitiers, ventured to affirm that the epithets "God" and "Son of God," were applied to our Saviour only by reason of his adoption[7], and in various other respects had broached doctrines which were justly held to be pernicious novelties. Tanchelin denied that the Sacraments conduced to man's salvation[8]. Even the celebrated Peter Lombard, "the Master of the Sentences," held that our Lord, inasmuch as He was man,

[7] Labb. Concil. x. 1125; Otho Frising. lib. i. cap. l, and a sketch of his history given by Mabillon in his preface to St. Bernard's Works, § 58, seqq.

[8] Acta SS. mens. Junii, tom. i. pp. 843. 845.

was nothing[9], and was led into other errors by his too great predilection for the authority of Abelard[1]. Abelard himself was shocked by the lengths to which some theorists went, and draws a fearful picture of the wild heresies then current, many of which are too blasphemous for translation[2]. Such opinions as these caused much anxiety among the orthodox party, for the influence of their rivals was by no means inconsiderable[3]. They discouraged all inquiry and speculation with a severity which was perhaps ill-judged, and they saw heresy where it did not exist, or might have been satisfactorily explained, had an explanation been admitted[4]. John of Cornwall, who had been led astray by this philosophy, falsely so called, after his recantation, forbad[5] his disciples to reason systematically upon such questions as the Trinity, the Incarnation of our Saviour, and the Sacraments; and Stephanus Tornacensis would not even permit a young monk to study at Paris, apprehensive that the peace of his monastery would be disturbed by scholastic controversies[6] introduced within its walls. Such being the state of feeling between the rival parties, we need not be surprised that Abelard regarded with much anxiety the ecclesiastical proceedings which were now about to be instituted against himself and his doctrines.

An incident occurred on his arrival at Soissons, where the matter was to be discussed, which must have filled Abelard with no small apprehension. The populace arose in a tumult, and had they not been prevented, they would have stoned him to death, as well as the scanty band of admirers who followed him thither. He lost no time in presenting to the papal legate, Conan, bishop of Preneste, a copy of the obnoxious treatise which he had been enjoined to bring with him for examination, and he professed his willingness to correct such of its statements as could be proved to be contrary to the teaching of the Catholic Church. This was delivered to his accusers, who carefully examined it in the legate's presence, but finding in it nothing to censure, they requested that its consideration might be reserved till the end of the meeting, in order that they might

[9] Rog. Wendov. Chron. ii. 401, edit. H. Coxe, Mart. Anecdot. v. 1657.

[1] Mart. Anecdot. v. 1666.

[2] Mart. Anecdot. v. 1314, 1315.

[3] John of Cornwall tells us that there were "infiniti scholares hoc calice debriati, et in furorem versi, usque in hodiernum diem." Mart. Anecdot. v. 1657.

[4] It was the opinion of Otho of Frisingen, that St. Bernard was greatly alarmed at the movement of this party, "et si quicquam ei Christianæ fidei absonum de talibus diceretur, facile aurem præberet." Lib. i. cap. xlvii. col. 678.

[5] Mart. Anecdot. v. 1679.

[6] Bibl. Patr. XII. ii. 511, edit. Colon. 1618.

have the opportunity of inspecting it more at their leisure. Before each meeting of the council, Abelard from day to day addressed the people; he told them what his opinions really were, and vindicated himself from the accusations under which he laboured. He was not long in convincing his hearers, that he had been misunderstood and calumniated. Towards the conclusion of the meeting, Alberic blandly asked Abelard to explain to him the meaning which he wished to convey in a sentence which he had written upon the generation of the Godhead, the orthodoxy of which appeared to be questionable. Abelard did so, and referred his questioner to a parallel passage in the writings of St. Augustine. Alberic was defeated, and retired full of anger and threats.

On the last day of the council, Abelard's business came under their discussion. While the papal legate, Rodulph, archbishop of Rheims, and his other enemies, hesitated how to proceed, although they were bent on severe measures, Geoffrey, bishop of Chartres, advised them to act with prudence and moderation. He reminded them that among Abelard's numerous admirers there would be no lack of men ready and able to vindicate their master; that the doctrines advanced were not palpably and broadly heretical, and that if they wished to deal with him according to the canon, he should be called in, and have the opportunity of being heard before his condemnation. This advice was rejected, upon the plea that Abelard, if admitted, would overpower the assembly with his sophisms. The friendly bishop then suggested that the heretic should be reconveyed to the monastery of St. Denys, the monks of which might possibly be able to bring him to a saner frame of mind by their learning. The legate and the rest assented to this proposal; and it was about to be carried, when Abelard's personal enemies fearing that he would escape from their hands if permitted to enter another diocese to which their influence did not extend, obtained an important alteration in the sentence. Having been summoned, he was ordered with his own hands to commit the obnoxious treatise to the flames, and to recite the Athanasian Creed; and he was then placed under the custody of the abbot of St. Medard, who was charged to convey him to that monastery.

The abbot and monks of St. Medard treated their unhappy inmate with consideration and humanity, and attempted, but in vain, to lessen the bitterness of his imprisonment. They could not alleviate the mental pangs which he endured, in comparison with which he regarded as nothing his former bodily sufferings. His stay in this abode was of no long duration, for the papal legate, when leaving France on his way homeward, gave orders

that Abelard should be permitted to return to the monastery of St. Denys. Here he spent some months in comparative tranquillity, but a circumstance occurred which renewed against him all the former ill-will of the brethren. The monks of St. Denys were sensitive upon all questions connected with the honour of their patron Saint. Whom, in accordance with an early tradition, they affirmed to have been Dionysius the Areopagite mentioned by St. Luke [7], afterwards Bishop of Athens and the Apostle of Gaul; and they imagined that the safety of the kingdom of France, and the glory of the Gallican Church, depended somehow upon the maintenance of this theory. It happened however, unfortunately for Abelard, that in reading the commentary of the Venerable Beda upon the Acts of the Apostles, he noticed that Dionysius was styled by that writer, not the Bishop of Athens, but the Bishop of Corinth; and he incidentally pointed out the sentence to those persons who happened to be standing near him at the moment. They were so much scandalized by the insinuation, that they called Beda a lying writer, and asked Abelard which of the two accounts *he* believed. When he answered that he considered Beda's written authority preferable to their tradition, they summoned him before the chapter, and threatened to denounce him to the king as one ill-affected to the glory of the French crown. In vain he requested that he might be judged by the ecclesiastical law; they persisted in threatening him with all the severities of the civil judicature. He was so much alarmed by these menaces, that he stole by night from the monastery, and took refuge in the neighbouring territory of Theobald, Earl of Champagne. By the kindness of this nobleman, with whom he had been previously acquainted, a refuge was afforded him, yet not secure enough to protect him from the enmity of his offended abbot, who threatened him with the extremity of the civil law as well as the ecclesiastical. The death of this individual, which occurred shortly afterwards, relieved him from much anxiety, especially as his successor in the abbey of St. Denys, the well-known Suger, was induced to abandon the prosecution; and Abelard was permitted to select his own place of abode, provided he did not take up his residence within any monastery.

The use which he made of his newly-acquired liberty was singular. He appears to have discovered that the peace which may be found in retirement was more to be desired than the notoriety which was attended by danger. Having obtained the approbation of the bishop of the diocese for the step which he was about to take, he retired with a single companion to a remote

[7] Acts xvii. 34.

and uninhabited spot in the neighbourhood of Nogent sur Seine, upon the river Ardusson, and there built himself a rude oratory of reeds and twigs, which he dedicated to the Holy Trinity. But, ere long, his hiding-place was discovered by his pupils, and they assembled in great numbers round their instructor. They readily exchanged, says he, the city for the wilderness; leaving their spacious houses, they built for themselves mean hovels; they were contented to exchange their beds of down for a couch of straw, and their usual dainty fare for herbs and coarse bread, which they ate from the grass, since they had no other table. The little oratory could not hold the number of the students; and it was quickly replaced by one built of more substantial materials, which Abelard dedicated to the Paraclete, in grateful acknowledgment of the unexpected blessings which had been vouchsafed to him by the God of all consolation. In this unusual title his enemies imagined that they detected proofs of his heresy, and they affirmed that there was no example of a church being dedicated to one single Person of the Trinity. There was probably more ground for censure in an image erected by him in the same church, which was intended to represent and explain the mystery of the Trinity. It was to be expected that such eccentricities as these should bring him once more under the notice of his more steady contemporaries, by whom his movements would naturally be watched with suspicion. He accuses, but without naming them, St. Norbert and St. Bernard as having been the chief instigators of this new persecution. As far as the latter is concerned this is certainly a mistake, for we have the testimony of the Abbot of Clairvaux himself (testimony above all suspicion), for believing that he had paid no attention to Abelard's doctrines until twelve or thirteen years afterwards, when they were brought before his notice by William de St. Thierri[8]. Be that as it may, all Abelard's former apprehensions for his safety were revived, and he imagined that the whole world was banded together for his destruction. He paints his terrors in language which can scarcely be read without a smile, so amusingly do timidity and vanity blend themselves together. He takes God to witness that he could not hear of the meeting of a few ecclesiastics without supposing that it was for his condemnation. He expected to be cited as a profane person or an heretic. He compared himself to St. Athanasius when persecuted by the Arians. He fell into such despair (God's name is again invoked in truth of this statement), that he planned how he might escape from among the Christians, and live among the heathen.

[8] Epist. 327, Opp. i. 305.

So willing was he to accept any terms from the enemies of Christ, that he rejoiced upon the whole that his faith had been questioned, since this accusation would procure for him a kinder reception among the infidels[9].

Abelard was prevented from carrying this wicked design into execution by an occurrence which placed him among men who, though monks and Christians, were worse in his opinion than the very heathen themselves. While he was distracted by such fears and anxieties as these, the monastery of St. Gildas de Ruits in Bretagne became vacant by the death of its abbot, and the office having been offered to Abelard, was joyfully accepted by him, yet it was valued only as affording a retreat from the impending tempest. It was his misfortune to discover vice and to experience unkindness wherever he went; but never were monks so wicked, never was abbot so persecuted, as were the monks and the abbot of St. Gildas. The neighbourhood where he now found himself was barren and unpleasant; he was ignorant of the language spoken in the district; the possessions of the monastery were overrun by a neighbouring chieftain, who taxed them to an amount which they were unable to sustain. The monks appropriated to themselves the revenues which were intended for the general purposes of the monastery, and squandered them upon their own pleasures, and then stormed at their abbot because he was unable to meet the necessary expenses of the establishment. Even his life was endangered, for they made several attempts to remove him by poison. In the midst of these persecutions he heard that the nunnery of Argenteuil, of which Heloise was the prioress, was about to be removed, to make room for the monks of St. Denys. He gladly availed himself of the opportunity which this occurrence gave him of visiting his wife; and he removed her, with such of the sisterhood as were inclined to accompany her, to the solitude of the Paraclete. By the permission of Otho, Bishop of Troyes, and Pope Innocent II., the oratory which he had erected was converted into a nunnery, of which Heloise was made the abbess. Abelard's residence among the sisterhood was abridged by the reports which scandal circulated as to the motives which led him thither; and he was unwillingly compelled to exchange this happy retreat for the miseries of the abbey of St. Gildas.

On his return he endeavoured to alleviate his sorrows by detailing them in a long epistle which he addressed to a friend, whose name is now here mentioned[1]. This valuable document

[9] Opp. p. 32.

[1] Opp. pp. 3—41.

contains a sketch of his history from his boyhood up to the period at which it was written. Although not without a decided bias in favour of his own prejudices, it exhibits upon the whole much candour, and bears every appearance of truth in its leading features. If he is severe upon those from whom he had experienced unkindness, he certainly does not screen himself, but exposes his own failings and crimes with an unsparing hand. This letter has not only given us the outline of the preceding narrative, but we are further indebted to it for having been the means of originating the correspondence between Abelard and Heloise, which we are now about to introduce to our readers.

A copy of this epistolary narrative having accidentally fallen into the hands of the abbess of the Paraclete, she read it with the most lively interest. Observing towards its conclusion that Abelard considered his life endangered by the violence and the treachery of his monks, she could no longer conceal her anxiety; and though no letters had passed between them since they took the vows, she resolved that she would no longer keep silence, and she wrote to him without delay. In her letter, which is preserved[2], she chides him affectionately for his persevering silence, and she tells him how great would be her joy could she hear of his welfare. The letter she had just read had pained her much, and she exhorts him by various arguments (backed by authority of Xenophon and Seneca) no longer to keep her in suspense, but to relieve her anxiety by writing. Abelard in his reply[3] assures her that his silence had proceeded from no want of affection, but was simply a matter of prudence and expedience. He thanks her for the kindly interest which she had taken in his welfare, and asks for the continuance of her prayers and those of her nuns, to the efficacy of which he attaches much importance. He speaks doubtingly, nay despondingly, as to his own safety, and requests that his body might be interred at his beloved Paraclete if he should fall a victim to the malice of his enemies.

This letter awoke in the bosom of Heloise all the affection which she had so long striven to extinguish. She made haste, under the first impulse of her heart, to assure him that he had undervalued his own worth, and too highly estimated her character; and, with all the unselfishness of a woman, she proceeded to make good her assertion by entering into various details taken from the history of their early acquaintance, through which we cannot follow her. She sees cause for much regret that the punishment due to the crime in which both shared should have fallen upon him alone, and that he should have suffered at the

[2] Opp. p. 41.

[3] Opp. p. 49.

very time when he had made the best atonement in his power for their mutual offence[4].

In his reply[5], Abelard traced step by step, and refuted the objections and difficulties which his wife had started. He gently rebukes her for having been overpowered by the mention of his sorrow, adding, that as true friends it was their duty as well as their privilege to support each other through whatever might be their lot to suffer. He reminds her that they both might derive much benefit from the unhappy circumstances in which they were placed; and he exhorts her to abstain for the future from such worse than useless regrets and complaints. He follows her through the recollections to which she had referred him, and from them he deduces arguments why they should feel deep gratitude to God, Who of His mercy had chastened them both in the person of him alone. He admits the justice and mercy of his punishment; he shows her what benefits have already resulted from it; and he teaches her how to derive from it others yet more important.

Heloise had the good sense and the good feeling to profit by these admonitions. In the letter[6] which immediately follows, we read none of the passionate regrets and complaints with which her former correspondence had abounded. The mind is not always under our own control, she remarks; and when the mind is sad, it will leave traces of its sadness upon every thing around its influence. Instead of adopting a tone which must have agitated herself no less than her husband, she leads his thoughts from the contemplation of their sad history, and interests him in subjects akin to his former tastes and pursuits. She and her nuns have now discovered that they are ignorant upon some questions, and they are anxious to have the benefit of his advice, knowledge, and experience. They wish to know something about the origin and the early history of nuns; and furthermore, as none of the fathers have framed a rule applicable to a nunnery, they request that he would compile one for their sisterhood.

In replying to the former of these questions, the opportunity was afforded Abelard of displaying his erudition, and in the second his wisdom and experience. He availed himself of this opportunity, and he answered both inquiries at considerable length. It is not our intention to follow him through the letters extending over more than one hundred closely printed quarto pages[7]. The scheme, founded upon Heloise's acquaintance with the character of Abelard, succeeded perfectly; he became deeply interested in these investigations, and she wisely resolved that there should be

[4] Opp. p. 54.
[5] Opp. p. 62.
[6] Opp. p. 78.
[7] Opp. pp. 94—197.

no lack of occupation. Ere long he received a letter, informing him that the nuns of the oratory in their reading had met with many obscure passages of Holy Writ; and he was requested to explain several "hard texts" which were enclosed. Happy in the thought that herein he was imitating St. Jerome, Abelard set himself to the task, and answered the forty-two questions thus proposed for his solution.

With such occupations as these, his wife strove to divert the attention of Abelard from dwelling too intently upon the persecutions from without, and the memories from within, by which she knew him to be assailed. It is obvious that to some extent she succeeded in this office of kindness, but for how long a period, we know not with any degree of accuracy. This, however, is certain, that in the year 1136 (how much sooner we know not) he had abandoned the abbey of St. Gildas, and was again employed in teaching philosophy at Mont St. Genevieve in Paris, with all his accustomed brilliancy and success. In the following year, however, he abandoned this occupation, why, we know not, nor can we ascertain the place where he afterwards resided. But wherever that may have been, he was not idle. He employed himself in the composition of various theological treatises, which were much admired by some, not only from the literary skill which they exhibited, but also from the novelty of the doctrines which they propounded. There were others, however, who regarded them with a less friendly eye, and discovered in them mingled presumption and heresy. One of these was William, abbot of St. Thierri, who deduced from Abelard's writings such propositions as to him appeared the most startling, and despatched copies of them to the most influential ecclesiastics of the age, of whom the most celebrated was St. Bernard, and he accompanied them with a letter requesting that his correspondent would examine them at their leisure [8].

St. Bernard's answer is marked by that humility which formed such a prominent feature in his character. He had no doubt as to the heresy of these opinions, and he believed them to be highly dangerous; but he was unwilling that any proceedings should be instituted against the offender upon the responsibility of his own private judgment [9]; and he fixed a day upon which they might examine, at their leisure, this obnoxious treatise with the calmness which the deep importance of the subject appeared to demand.

[8] S. Bernardi Ep. 326.

[9] . . . . meo judicio non satis, ut optime nostis, fidere consuevi, præsertim in tam magnis rebus. . . . . Ep. 327.

The result of this writing confirmed St. Bernard and his correspondent in the opinion which they had separately and independently formed; but anxious for the welfare of one for whose talents and acquirements they both entertained a high opinion [1], they resolved to seek a private interview with him, that they might, if possible, convince him of his errors. St. Bernard's affectionate remonstrances appear to have produced a considerable impression on their first interview; and Abelard promised that he would be guided by his advice in endeavouring to correct the errors which he had been the means of circulating. If he were sincere in this promise when he made it, his good intentions speedily vanished; for no sooner had his friendly monitor departed, than he was persuaded by some evil counsellors to avow his sentiments openly, to defend them at all hazards [2]. It is not improbable that he was induced to take this step by the influence of Arnold of Brescia, who having been expelled from Italy, had at that time taken refuge in France [3].

Disappointed and grieved at this unexpected event, St. Bernard's charity grew not cold. In the presence of two or three witnesses he advised Abelard to recant, and he attempted to dissuade his scholars from reading such treatises as were tainted with heresy. But all his persuasions were ineffectual; for Abelard laid the matter before the Archbishop of Sens, and requested that a council might be summoned to give him the opportunity of defending those doctrines of which the orthodoxy had been assailed by the abbot of Clairvaux. The archbishop consented, and having fixed that the meeting should be holden at Sens upon the octave of the feast of Pentecost, A. D. 1140, he wrote to apprize St. Bernard of this arrangement, and requested him to attend at the day and place appointed [4].

St. Bernard was not prepared for such an arrangement, and declined to meet Abelard upon such terms as he had proposed. He himself was but a stripling, he said, whereas his adversary had been a man of war from his youth up; he was unwilling that his own powers of reasoning and disputation should be made the test of the truth or falsehood of the articles of the Christian faith; and he asserted that as Abelard's written works contained these questionable doctrines, they should be appealed to, and if necessary, censured by the ecclesiastical authority. He main-

[1] William de St. Thierri, writing to St. Bernard, thus speaks of Abelard, "Dilexi et ego eum et diligere vellem, Deus testis est; sed in causa hac nemo unquam mihi proximus erit vel amicus." S. Bernardi Ep. 326.

[2] S. Bernardi Vita Prima, lib. iii. cap. v. § 13.

[3] S. Bernardi Ep. 189.

[4] S. Bernardi Vita, ut supra.

tained, in the last place, that the dispute was not between individuals, and that he was not personally required to attend, especially as an accuser or a disputant, since the interests of the whole Church were involved[5]. Such were St. Bernard's first impressions; upon more matured deliberation however, he resolved to attend the meeting. At the time appointed, a numerous body of ecclesiastics and nobility assembled at Sens; the king himself was present. The friends of Abelard had already decided that their master would find no difficulty in overcoming a man whose terror was obvious to all. But the result was widely different from what they had anticipated; St. Bernard's manly and honest line of attack completely baffled the more wily Abelard. A series of propositions, extracted from his works, were read before the council, and when he expected to have the opportunity of defending them with all the skill of a sophist, St. Bernard arose, and abruptly required that Abelard (if he admitted that these articles were the fair expression of his opinions) should show that they were consistent with the teaching of antiquity, and that they were not, as had been asserted by his accusers, the inventions of his own reasonings. He felt himself so surprised by this unexpected attack, that instead of replying to the demand, he at once appealed from the council to the Pope, and hurried from the assembly, leaving friends and foes alike astonished at his timidity and irresolution. The council acted with moderation. The judges resolved to separate the errors of Abelard from the individual, and while they condemned the one, to leave the other to the pontiff to whom he had appealed. They instructed St. Bernard to furnish Innocent II. with an account of their proceedings, and they accompanied it with a list of the errors which they had pronounced to be heretical[6].

Abelard hastened from the assembly to support the appeal which he had made to the court of Rome. He had arrived at Lyons, when the intelligence reached him that the Pope, without awaiting his arrival, had confirmed the decision of the council of Sens, had caused his writings to be burnt, and had issued directions that he and Arnold of Brescia should each be immured for the remainder of their lives in separate monasteries. Overpowered with this accumulation of sorrow, Abelard needed a counsellor and friend, and he found one in the person of Peter

[5] Ep. 189.

[6] These "Capitula hæresum Petri Abælardi," fourteen in number, are printed by Mabillon in his introduction to the treatise of St. Bernard against Abelard. A more correct copy than that used by Mabillon is contained in the British Museum. MS. Reg. 8. F. xv.

the Venerable, then abbot of Cluni. Acting upon his advice, he resolved to resist no longer, but to seek a reconciliation with St. Bernard and the Pope. Supported by the influence of Peter, he was successful in both applications, and the sentence of excommunication which had been pronounced against him was removed. Thus relieved from all further anxiety, the evening of Abelard's eventful life passed away in serenity and peace. Life now had little to offer him, and he had found that which he most needed, a tranquil resting-place in which he might prepare himself for the approach of death.

And death was not long in taking the wearied man to himself. The austerities which he practised upon a frame attenuated by long continued anxieties and labours, induced a fever, to which he fell a victim upon the 21st of April, A.D. 1142, being then in the sixty-third year of his age.

Peter the Venerable hastened to communicate this intelligence to Heloise, and hesitated not to compare the deceased to St. Germain, and St. Martin; the first of whom he resembled in his humility, the latter in his poverty. According to the testimony of this friend, who had ample opportunity of observing the tone of mind in which Abelard passed the evening of his life, his heart was always intent upon sacred things, his lips spoke of them, and they were exhibited in his conduct.

The answer of Heloise was affectionate, yet calm and dignified. She requested that the body of her husband might be transmitted to the Paraclete for interment there, according to his own request; she recommended to his protection her son Astralabe; and she requested him to send an attested copy of the absolution which he had pronounced over the body of Abelard, that it might be affixed to his tomb. Twenty-one years afterwards, on the 17th of May, 1163, the same tomb was again opened to receive the body of Heloise.

The remains of few individuals have undergone more frequent disentombments and reinterments, than those of Abelard and Heloise. We shall notice very briefly such of them as have been mentioned by M. and Mme. Guizot.

The bodies were permitted to repose in peace, until the year 1497, when they were placed in separate tombs, one on each side of the cathedral church of Nogent. In this position they remained until 1630, when Marie de la Rochefoucauld removed them to the chapel of the Trinity, and her successor, Marie de Roncy de la Rochefoucauld, in 1766, erected a new monument to their memory. The epitaph which she caused to be placed over it, was furnished by the Academy of Inscriptions, and is in better taste than the generality of such productions of

that period[7]. In 1792, when the decree for the destruction of the French convents was issued, the authorities of Nogent determined upon preserving whatever remained of the bodies of these lovers. They went in procession to the church, they disentombed the relics, and having pronounced a funeral oration over them, placed them in the same grave, but separated from each other by a thin leaden partition.

Under the ministry of Lucien Bonaparte in the year 1800, the remains were transferred to the Jardin du Musée Français, and deposited within a chapel constructed out of the ruins of the Paraclete and the abbey of St. Denys. Upon being opened, the tomb was found to contain a considerable portion of the scull and lower jaw of Abelard, together with some of the ribs, the vertebræ, and the greater part of the thigh and leg bones. Time had spared the scull of Heloise, as were also the bones of the lower extremities. Judging from these remains, it would appear that both Abelard and Heloise were tall and well proportioned.

In 1815 the site of this chapel having been ceded to the Mont de Piété, the relics were once more disturbed, and on the 6th of November, 1817, they were finally deposited in Père Lachaise, where they now remain.

[7] We therefore transcribe it. "Hic, sub eodem marmore, jacent, hujus monasterii conditor, Petrus Abælardus, et abbatissa prima Heloissa; olim studio, ingenio, amore, infaustis nuptiis et pœnitentia, nunc æterna, quod speramus, felicitate conjuncti. Petrus obiit XX. prima Aprilis MC.LII. Heloissa XVII. Maii MC.LXIII."

Art. IV. 1.—*Du Protestantisme, suivi d'une Dissertation sur le Casuel et d'un Abrégé de la Religion Anglicane, par* Joseph F. P. Paris, 1842.

2. *Du Mouvement religieux en Angleterre, ou les Progrès du Catholicisme, et le Retour de l'Église Anglicane à l'Unité: par un Catholique.* Paris, 1844.

3. *La Réforme contre la Réforme, ou Retour à l'Unité Catholique par la Voie du Protestantisme; traduit de l'Allemand de Hoeninghaus, par MM.* W. *et* S.; *précédé d'une Introduction par M.* Audin, *Auteur des Histoires de Luther, de Calvin, et de Léon X.* 2 volumes. Paris, 1845.

4. *Conversion de soixante Ministres Anglicans ou Membres des Universités Anglaises et de cinquante personnes de distinction; avec une Notice sur MM. Newman, Ward, et Oakeley; par* Jules Gondon; *précédé d'une Lettre de Monseigneur Wiseman.* Paris, 1846.

If lying and boasting be fruits and evidences of that spirit of truth and humility which belongs peculiarly to the discipleship of Christ, then, indeed, the claim of the papal system to be Christian, κατ' ἐξοχήν, must be allowed; but if not, if lying and boasting are fruits and evidences of the spirit of darkness and of pride, then unquestionably Rome is bearing witness against herself by the very deeds and words by which she seeks and hopes to accomplish her victories. To a rightly constituted mind there is something singularly repulsive in the tone and language adopted by the Romanists in their controversial writings; something which clearly indicates that the cause whose battles are fought with such weapons, and its triumphs celebrated in such strains, is not, cannot be, the holy cause of truth. Fraud and falsehood of every shade and description, from the most palpable to the most subtle, run through their representations of the facts of the Reformation, and of the doctrines of the different bodies which in consequence of the religious convulsion of the sixteenth century, have ceased to be in communion with Rome. And while they thus endeavour by the grossest mis-statements, to create a prejudice against every thing that bears the name of reformation, in the minds of the ignorant and unwary; what are the means on which they rely for that restoration of the former ascendancy of the papal system,

both here and elsewhere, to which at present all their hopes and energies are directed? Have they recourse to that mighty Apostolic weapon, the persuasive force of truth, the demonstration of the Spirit and of power? Is it with the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, under the banner of Christ, in reliance upon his intercession, and the assistance of the Holy Ghost sent by Him from the Father, that they go forth conquering and to conquer? No! They invoke, it is true, the aid of a heavenly ally. They announce to the world, that it is by prayers that they mean to bring all the differing communions back to the unity of "the Catholic Church;" but to whom are those prayers directed? by whose intervention are they to be presented before the throne of God? whose powerful influence and irresistible intercession is relied on for their success? The Virgin Mary, a creature,—blessed among women, it is true, but yet a creature, yea, and by Christ's own verdict[1], not blessed *above* all creatures, but only blessed *among* them,—she whom, in derogation of the royalty of Christ, the Romish Church has exalted to the dignity of queen of heaven; whom, in disregard of the exclusiveness of the mediatorial office of Christ[2], she has erected into a mediatrix, ascribing to her an unlimited power, not of influence only, but of *command*, over her divine Son, and thus making a creature's will, in the place of the eternal will of God, the groundwork of men's salvation,—she, the Virgin Mary it is, by whose invocation the conversion of the world to the faith and obedience, not of Christ, but of Rome, is to be brought about.

A perpetual rejoicing in, a gloating upon iniquity of every kind, characterise the high hopes which the Roman Church has conceived of proximate triumph over all the opposition against which for these three hundred years she has contended in vain. With keen and eager eye she watches the perplexities of nations; with unfeigned delight she hails, with untiring zeal she foments, the elements of civil and religious discord wherever they appear; she agitates with the demagogue for the subversion of the government and constitution of every kingdom which does not own allegiance to her usurped and tyrannical domination; and exultingly she re-echoes the calumnies of the sectarian, the fallacies of the heretic, the ravings of the fanatic, yea, and the blasphemies of the infidel, for the purpose of damaging and neutralizing every testimony to Christ's holy truth, which is independent of her assumed spiritual supremacy, and unadulterated by the errors and corruptions of her system of doctrine and of worship. Not to build up, is her endeavour, but to pull down; not to plant, but

[1] Luke xi. 27, 28. [2] 1 Tim. ii. 5.

to root out; that in the universal desolation she may stand alone upon the earth, the only refuge of the harassed conscience and the distracted mind. It is not by a high and holy hope that she seeks to win the nations, but by a deep and black despair that she hopes to drive them into her fold.

This unhallowed character of Rome's warfare against differing communions does not appear to us to be sufficiently known or properly appreciated; and we think, therefore, that we may render service to the cause of truth, if we present our readers with an analysis of some publications which have recently been put forth by the Romanists, more particularly in relation to our own Church, whose downfall, above all others, is the object of their ambition, and the aim to which their strenuous endeavours are directed. We have arranged them, at the head of this article, in the order of their appearance; but for the purposes of discussion we shall take them according to their subjects; beginning with the one whose scope is more general, the work of Hoeninghaus (No. 3), which the French edition by M. Audin has rendered more accessible and more generally known than it was in its original German garb. This is, in fact, nothing more than a theological cento, composed with much industry and ingenuity, but without much erudition or fairness, though there is a considerable display of both. The German author of the compilation, which appeared about ten years ago, is a Roman Catholic, and not, as is erroneously and boastingly stated by the *Ami de la Religion*[3], a Protestant. This evidently appears from the introduction of M. Audin, who describes him as being, "*himself a Catholic*, constantly saluted in his passage across the regions of Protestantism, by a number of souls, fallen away indeed, yet marked on the forehead with streaks of light;" and speaks of "the homage which by his means the bright luminaries of Protestantism have been made to render to the doctrines, the morality, the discipline, the institutions, and the liturgy of that holy Roman Church *in which Hoeninghaus had the good fortune to be born*[4]." To this may be added the conclusive evidence of a passage quoted by M. Audin from Hoeninghaus' own preface: "This book is not written against the Protestants, but against Protestantism; *may it bring our erring brethren back to unity*[5]!" The title of the German original is, "Result of my wanderings through the domain of Protestant literature, or the necessity of returning to the Catholic

[3] No. 4110. Sept. 2, 1845. [4] Audin, Introduction, p. lxxxiv.
[5] Ibid. p. lxxxvi.

Church, demonstrated exclusively by the admissions of Protestant divines and philosophers themselves[6]." The translation is executed, as the title indicates, by two different hands, and as far as we are enabled to judge, in the absence of the German original, in a somewhat loose manner; so much so, that one and the same passage being quoted more than once, which is not unfrequently the case, appears in different parts of the work in altogether different phraseology. The responsibility of the publication has been assumed by M. Audin, previously known as the author of histories of Luther, Calvin, and Leo X.; of the two former works, which have gone through several editions, he has also published abridgments for the use of the young, which have received the approbation of several Archbishops and Bishops. M. Audin, whom we may therefore consider as an accredited writer of the Romish communion, gives in his introduction a rapid outline of the argument of Hoeninghaus, preceded by the following grandiloquent remarks:—

"Möhler, the author of the Symbolic, had read the book of Hoeninghaus. We have repeatedly heard him speak of it as of a kind of prodigy of philological erudition; he used to call it a Benedictine performance.

"He was right; in the whole field of German literature, fruitful as it has been since the Reformation, there is not a single Protestant of any value whom he has not put under contribution. He has consulted the theologians, the philosophers, the historians, the moralists, and even the poets; and of all these dissenting writers, dead and living, he has formed a kind of choir, in which all the voices, in unison, sing a canticle to the glory of Catholicism. Upon Catholicism, as it appears in its faith, in its doctrine, in its liturgy, in its discipline, in its fathers, in its doctors, in its pontiffs, in its religious orders, the praises of our separatist brethren are bestowed. Hoeninghaus listens and transcribes every note of this splendid hymn.

"There is no irritating controversy here; it is simply the beautiful idea of Cicero carried into effect: 'Wonderful power of truth, which is able of itself to resist all the cleverness of human genius[7]. In one word, it is Protestantism arrayed against Protestantism. Hoeninghaus, in those debates, performs the office of reporter. With painful com-

[6] Das Resultat meiner Wanderungen durch das Gebiet der Protestantischen Literatur, oder die Nothwendigkeit der Rückkehr zur Katholischen Kirche, ausschliesslich durch die eigenen Eingeständnisse Protestantischer Theologen und Philosophen dargethan, von Dr. Julius B. Hoeninghaus.

[7] We translate from M. Audin's version; the reference is to Cic. Cœl. 26. *O magna vis veritatis, quæ contra hominum ingenia, calliditatem, sollertiam, contraque fictas omnium insidias facile se per se ipsa defendat.* A quotation most apposite to the preservation of Catholic truth, in spite of Rome and the Jesuit Order!

posure he witnesses, as a bystander, this duel of error against error, faithfully recording all the admissions in favour of Catholicism, extorted by that mysterious power of which the Roman orator speaks. And let there be no mistake ; they are not obscure intelligences which lay open the miseries of the Reformation, but the most glorious organs of the three schools of Wittemberg, Geneva, and Zürich, from Luther, Calvin, and Zwingli to our days."—Introduction, pp. vi. vii.

How far the work itself answers to this high-sounding announcement, we shall now proceed to examine. We are not prepared to say that if it had been possible to collect testimonies from the most distinguished writers of the different Protestant communions, in favour of the leading points controverted between them and the Roman Church, it would not have been, though not a conclusive evidence that Rome has the truth on her side, yet a very great and just cause of triumph to the latter. But in order to make out a case upon this plan, three things would be required :—1. that the extracts should all be taken from such writers as may be considered fair witnesses, the acknowledged representatives of the respective Protestant communions, and impartial chroniclers of their history ; 2. that the passages adduced should have reference to the points on which they are alleged as testimonies ; and 3. that they should be fairly and fully quoted, so as to present a faithful expression of the sentiments of those from whose writings they are taken. To string together detached passages, sometimes consisting of no more than half a sentence from one author, tacked on to another half sentence from another author, without the least regard to the above requirements, is evidently dishonest ; but if it should turn out that the principal part of the extracts are taken from the avowed opponents, and often the virulent revilers of these Protestant communions ; that the passages from the writings of those who might be considered fair witnesses, are comparatively few in number ; and that even those few are, for the most part, garbled quotations, torn out of their context, and cunningly introduced into a context in which they appear to mean the very contrary of what the authors of them really thought and said,—if this should turn out to be the case, then such a compilation of Protestant evidence in favour of Romanism, is nothing more or less than an impudent fraud, a disreputable trickery, such as, we venture to say, no Church but the Church of Rome would demean herself by attempting or abetting.

But our readers shall judge for themselves. The total number of authors quoted by Hoeninghaus is from 380 to 390 ; besides about 70 periodicals ; the sum total of quotations is upwards of

1800, of which about 200 are from periodicals, and the rest from authors whose names are given. Deducting from them the English authors, 70 names, and 180 to 190 quotations, of which more hereafter, there remain, having reference to the Protestant communions of the Continent, upwards of 1400 quotations, taken from more than 300 different authors.

Of these, a very large number are not Church writers at all, but historians, philosophers, poets, dramatists, novel writers, tourists, and the like; and of those who belong properly to the field of theological literature, there are many, of whose characters neither their names, nor the title of their books, nor the passages quoted, enable us to form any opinion. Omitting all these from our calculation, we find that Hoeninghaus has collected his materials in the following proportions: Of the Reformers of the sixteenth century, he adduces in all eleven names, with forty-four quotations; among them, two from Calvin, two from Zwingli, six from Melanchthon, and twenty-five from Luther; and nearly one-half of these do not bear in any way upon the doctrinal differences between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants, but exhibit the temper and personal character of the reformers in an unfavourable light. Thus, for instance, Calvin is put into the witness-box, to prove what? That he felt ashamed of the quarrels that took place between the Reformers, and that he thought it would have been a great blessing if Luther had had more command of his temper;—two very important admissions, it must be confessed, which make it as clear as the sun at noonday, that the Roman Church is supreme and infallible, and altogether in the right, and that the Reformation is altogether wrong! Of divines of the orthodox schools (taking the word "orthodox" in the Lutheran and Calvinistic sense), we have counted about twenty names, with about one hundred and thirty quotations; on the contrary, of Neologians, Rationalists, and Ultra-Rationalists, there are at least forty names, and upwards of four hundred citations. To enter into details, with regard to the foreign quotations, would carry us too far, and be scarcely interesting to our readers; a few specimens of the sort of men, and the kind of evidence, which the compiler of this cento presses into his service, may suffice under this head. *Inter alia* we have a quotation from Kotzebue's play, "*Geprüfte Liebe*" (Tried Love), to the effect that "what is new is always attractive, even though the old be better," which helps to demonstrate that the Reformation in Germany arose from a mere idle love of novelty. Frederic the Second of Prussia, a great king no doubt, but, we apprehend, a small authority in Church matters, is called to speak to the

character of the Jesuits, to state his preference for the Roman ceremonial over the Protestant form of worship, and to give his opinion that neither Luther nor Calvin had any claim to be reckoned among the "*fortes têtes.*" That distinguished Protestant divine, Jean Jacques Rousseau, who is all the better qualified to form an opinion on the subject, as he turned Papist for a little while before he became quite an infidel, supports the necessity of taking the infallible Church of Rome for a guide, in the most startling, not to say conclusive, manner, by maintaining that as the Reformers repudiated the authority of the "Catholic" Church, the "*moi individuel*" is the only interpreter of Scripture that can be recognized. Dr. Hufeland, the author of the "Macrobiotic" is subpœnaed on behalf of the celibacy of the clergy on physiological grounds; and the celebrated Lessing, who preferred a Jew to a Christian, because he believes less, and an infidel to both, because he believes nothing at all, is called to prove that the Bible is every whit as uncertain as tradition. But the most impudent of all, is the quotation of a passage from the life of Innocent III., by Hurter, whose defection to the Roman Church excited a considerable sensation some time ago in Switzerland, and who is, nevertheless, adduced here in the character of a *Protestant* witness to the superlative excellency of the Romish Church, to which, he says, "so many souls look up with suppliant eye, as to the rock which rises in the midst of the tempestuous waves."

So much for the evidence of foreign Protestants in support of the Romish Church, her supremacy, her doctrine, and her discipline. Turn we now to the materials which the Anglican Church has furnished for bolstering up the case of Rome, or, as Messrs. Hoeninghaus and Audin would say, proving it by irrefragable evidence, taken out of the mouths of Protestants themselves. Before we do so, however, we must not omit to mention two facts respecting our Church, which Mr. Hoeninghaus states on the authority of foreign writers; not only because they are in themselves conclusive, but because they may chance to be new to some of our readers. The first, for which a Dr. Wendeborn vouches, is, that the clergy in Wales are not unfrequently obliged to gain their livelihood by keeping a beer-shop and playing the fiddle to their customers and parishioners; the second, authenticated by Dr. Niemeyer, and originally resting, it seems, on the evidence of Hogarth's Rake's Progress, that a considerable portion of the prostitutes of London are the daughters of clergymen; which, of course, clearly proves the very great impropriety of allowing the clergy to marry, and beats all the arguments we

ever heard, not excepting even those of Mr. Ward, in favour of clerical celibacy.

We do not wish to detract from the credit due to Mr. Hoeninghaus for his industry in disinterring these two statements, for the more accurate information of the English clergy respecting their own condition; we are the more anxious to give him all the praise which is due to him on this head, because we are afraid we may have occasion to handle him somewhat severely, when once we engage him fairly on English ground. We have already mentioned that the number of English authors quoted in the two volumes before us amounts to seventy, the number of extracts from their writings to 180 or 190. Among these seventy names there are about twenty of which, though we have been at some pains to trace them out, we have not been able to get any certain account, from the imperfect way in which the citations are made, and the obscurity of the writers; some few are the names of dissenters; others, again, are historians, lawyers, physicians, and metaphysicians: thus Dr. Robertson, Lord Bacon, and a Mr. Dallas, are brought in as witnesses for the Jesuit order; Locke furnishes a passage to show, that on the hypothesis of infallibility the Romanist reasons correctly in yielding absolute submission to his Church; Angel and Saint-worship finds its apology in Dr. Thomas Browne's *Religio Medici;* Gibbon proves that one Benedictine convent has done more for literature than Oxford and Cambridge put together; and what is still more instructive, that the Papacy existed in full force during the first four centuries; and Hobbes, whose opinion on such a point cannot but have great weight, declares that the succession of the Roman is infinitely preferable to that of the Anglican Church. Occasionally we get a scrap from some speech in or out of parliament. Mr. Canning once expressed his surprise that people who sat by the side of Socinians, should object to the admission of Romanists into parliament; and Lord Bexley remarked at a meeting of the Reformation Society, that at the very time when the Pope was a prisoner in France, the papal power extended itself in America; nay, *horribile dictu*, a Mr. Thomson, at a Bible society meeting, on the 16th of March, 1830, offered to employ the devil himself in the distribution of Bibles; a strong statement, no doubt, to say nothing of its irreverence, but in our humble opinion, an exceedingly weak argument for Popery. The English missions, without much discrimination between Church and Dissent, come in for a large share of disparaging observation, for which purpose a motley company of naval and military officers, governors, judges, and envoys, are made to contribute their passing remarks, to which are added scraps from

the reports of the missionaries themselves; among them some from the journal of good Bishop Heber, loosely strung together in such a manner as to make the whole of our missionary work appear a total failure.

Having disposed of these extraneous matters, we now approach the phalanx of English divines, whose testimonies in favour of the Romish Church and her system, are marshalled in the course of the two volumes before us. Passing over thirteen names of minor note, to which sixteen insignificant quotations are attached, we come to a publication from which Mr. Hoeninghaus has not only made copious extracts, but from which we suspect that he has collected sundry of his other English quotations. The publication in question, which has furnished no less than twenty-one original shreds towards this famous piece of theological patchwork, is a pamphlet put forth some twenty-five years ago by the worthy vicar of St. Bartholomew the Less, under the title "Reflections concerning the expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate religious differences, and to promote the unity of religion in the bond of peace, humbly but earnestly recommended to the serious attention of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent, the most reverend the Archbishops, the right reverend the Bishops, the reverend the Clergy, and all lay persons who are able and willing dispassionately to consider the important subject." This pamphlet, which in furtherance of the purpose which it was intended to answer, smoothes down the differences between the Roman Church and our own as much as possible, while, at the same time, it bestows a profusion of strictures upon every species of dissent, must have been a perfect treasure to Mr. Hoeninghaus. In justice to Mr. Wix we feel bound to add, that with the exception of two or three passages exculpatory of the saint and angel worship of Rome, of the use of the crucifix as a help to devotion, and of the use of the Latin tongue in public worship, there is not much to find fault with in his statements, so far as they appear in the extracts made from them; they are generally consistent with the views and principles of the English Church, and tend rather to support ancient Catholic truth, than the errors of the Church of Rome. How far the pamphlet from which these extracts are taken may be entitled to the prominent place among our standard divines, which Mr. Hoeninghaus has assigned to it, his quotations from Mr. Wix's "Reflections" alone being nearly equal in number to those taken from all our standard divines put together, is quite another question, and one which we will not discuss; but we would recommend Messrs. Hoeninghaus and Audin, in case their book should live to see a second edition, to

complete this evidence by the addition of a few passages from the able and learned reply made to Mr. Wix's pamphlet by Dr. Burgess, the bishop of St. David's, under the title "English Reformation and Papal Schism; or, the Grand Schism of the Sixteenth Century in this Country, shown to have been the Separation of the Roman Catholics from the Church of England and Ireland, in a letter to the Right Honourable Lord Kenyon, on Mr. Wix's Plan of Union between the Churches of England and of Rome;" and moreover, we would recommend to them for insertion the extract from Archbishop Wake's letter, in reference to the proposals of Union between the Churches of England and of France, made, in 1718, by Dr. Du Pin, of the Sorbonne, which Mr. Wix transcribes, as setting forth the principle by which in his opinion any council between the Church of England and the Church of Rome should be guided. The extract is as follows:—

"I cannot tell well what to say to Dr. Du Pin. If he thinks we are to take their direction what to retain or what to give up, he is utterly mistaken. I am a friend to peace, but more to truth. And they may depend upon it, I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal foot with theirs; and that we are no more to receive laws from them, than we desire to impose any upon them. In short, the Church of England is free, is orthodox; she has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other Church to direct her what to retain or what to do. Nor will we, otherwise than in a brotherly way, and in a full equality of right and power, ever consent to have any treaty with that of France. And, therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for the foundation, that we are to deal with one another upon equal terms. If, consistently with our own establishment, we can agree upon a closer union with one another, well: if not, we are as much, and upon as good grounds, a free, independent Church, as they are [8]."

But we proceed. The standard divines of the English Church whom Mr. Hoeninghaus alleges as witnesses for Rome against the Reformation, are:—Bishops Patrick (2 quotations), Pearson (2), Andrews (1), Bull (1); Doctors Hammond (4), Waterland (4), Cave (1), Field (1); Herbert Thorndike (5), and Charles Wheatly (1); in all ten names and twenty-two extracts; to which must be added three nonjuring divines, Bishop Hickes (1), Dr. Brett (1), and Jeremy Collier (7). Let us now proceed to examine these quotations in particular. Wherever we have been enabled to trace the passages referred to, which on account of the slovenly

[8] See for "a circumstantial and exact account" of Archbishop Wake's correspondence on this subject with the French Doctors and the English Chaplain at Paris, Appendix iv. in vol. vi. of Dr. Maclaine's Translation of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History.

manner of quoting adopted by our compiler, is not at all times an easy matter, we shall place the original and the quotation as it appears in M. Audin's book side by side, marking the inaccuracies of the latter by italics.

Bishop Patrick, *On Tradition*, has the following passage, which affords Mr. Hoeninghaus two separate citations :—

"It is a calumny to affirm that the Church of England rejects *all tradition*, and I hope none of her true children are so ignorant, as when they hear that word, to imagine they must rise up and oppose it. No! the Scripture itself is a tradition; and we admit all other traditions which are subordinate and agreeable unto that; together with all those things which can be proved to be Apostolical by the general testimony of the Church in all ages [9]."

"C'est une calomnie que de prétendre, que l'Église Anglicane rejette *la tradition*."—Vol. i. p. 183.

"L'Écriture Sainte est elle-même une tradition."—Vol. i. p. 180.

Can any thing be more impudent than to make Bishop Patrick, on the ground of the above two and a half lines, a witness for tradition in the Romish sense? If Mr. Hoeninghaus has had Bishop Patrick's treatise before him, he can hardly have failed to meet with the following lines, which would have deterred any honest man from meddling further with Bishop Patrick for such a purpose :—

"True tradition is as great a proof against Popery, as it is for Episcopacy. The very foundation of the Pope's empire (which is his succession in St. Peter's supremacy) is utterly subverted by this; the constant tradition of the Church being evidently against it. And, therefore, let us not lose this advantage we have against them, by ignorantly refusing to receive true and constant tradition; which will be so far from leading us into their Church, that it will never suffer us to think of being of it, while it remains so opposite to that which is truly Apostolical [1]."

A passage from Bishop Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed*, furnishes two quotations, or rather one and the same quotation twice repeated, with some little variety of expression :—

"The necessity of believing the Holy Catholic Church appeareth first in this, that Christ hath appointed it as the only way unto eternal life. We read at the first, that the Lord added daily to the Church

[9] Bp. Patrick, on Tradition; see Tracts for the Times, No. 78, p. 82.
[1] Idem, ibid. p. 80.

such as should be saved; and what was then daily done, hath been done since continually. Christ never appointed two ways to heaven, nor did He build a Church to save some, and make *another institution* for other men's salvation[2]."

"Jamais le Christ n'indiqua deux chemins pour aller au ciel; jamais il ne fonda une Église pour le salut des uns, et *une autre Église* pour le salut des autres." —Vol. ii. p. 290.

"Jamais le Christ n'indiqua deux voies de salut; jamais il ne bâtit *deux Églises* l'une pour le salut de ceux-ci, l'autre pour le salut de ceux-là." —Vol. ii. p. 306.

Of what church is it that Bishop Pearson thus speaks? Surely not of the Church of Rome, to which Hoeninghaus dishonestly applies his language. Let us hear Bishop Pearson himself explain his meaning, again in a passage not very far distant from that made use of by our compiler:—

"As several Churches (in one city or nation) are reduced to the denomination of one Church, in relation to the single governor of those many Churches, so all the Churches of all cities and all nations in the world may be reduced to the same single denomination in relation to one Supreme Governor of them all, and that one governor is Christ, the bishop of our souls[3]."

And in a note, after adducing the well-known passage from Saint Cyprian *De Unitate*, ending in the words:—*Hoc erant utique et cæteri Apostoli, quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi, et honoris et potestatis; sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur*, Bishop Pearson quotes from Clement Alexandrinus (Stromat. l. vii.) the words, ἑνὸς ὄντος τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἑνὸς τοῦ Κυρίου, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἄκρως τίμιον κατὰ τὴν μόνωσιν ἐπαινεῖται, μίμημα ὂν ἀρχῆς τῆς μιᾶς, and then adds:

"This is very much to be observed, because that place of St. Cyprian is produced by the Romanists to prove the necessity of one head of the Church upon earth, and to show that the Bishop of Rome is that one head, by virtue of his succession to St. Peter; whereas St. Cyprian speaketh nothing of any such one head, nor of any such succession, but only of the origination of the Church, which was so disposed by Christ, that the unity might be expressed[4]."

The Sermon of Bishop Andrewes on the Power of Absolution, furnishes a passage in which the bishop is made to support the Romish sacrament of Penance. The former part of the

[2] Bp. Pearson on the Creed, p. 349.
[3] Idem, ibid. p. 338.
[4] Idem, ibid. p. 340.

quotation is not to be found at all in the sermon; it seems an abstract rather than a quotation, gathering up, far from accurately, the outline of the bishop's argument:—

"Where God proceedeth by the Church's act, as ordinarily He doth, it being his own ordinance, there, whosoever will be partaker of the Church's act, must be partaker of it by the Apostles' means, there doth *remiseritis* concur in his own order and place, and there runneth still a correspondence between both. There doth God associate *his ministers*, and maketh them workers together with Him. There have they their parts in this work, and cannot be excluded, no more in this than in the other acts and parts of their function. And to exclude *them*, is, after a sort, to wring the keys out of their hands to whom Christ hath given them; is to cancel and make void this clause of *remiseritis*, as if it were *no part of the sentence;* to account of all the *solemn* sending and *inspiring*, as if it were an idle and fruitless ceremony [5]."

"À quiconque vous remettrez les péchés ils seront remis (S. Jean, xx. 23). Ce commandement de Dieu que nous avons sous les yeux, nous ne pouvons pas le mutiler. Dans cette institution on a désigné clairement trois personnes: 1. la personne du pécheur dans ces mots *à quiconque;* 2. la personne de Dieu dans les mots *seront remis;* et, 3. la personne du prêtre dans les mots *à qui vous les remettrez.* Où l'on désigne trois individus, il en faut trois; où il en faut trois, deux ne suffisent pas.

Vouloir en exclure *le prêtre*, ce serait pour ainsi dire arracher les clefs des mains de ceux à qui Jésus-Christ les a données; effacer les mots *à qui vous les remettrez*, comme *s'ils se trouvaient par mégarde dans l'ordre de Dieu;* ce serait *ravaler* cette mission et ce *pouvoir*, et en faire une cérémonie vaine et inutile."—Vol. i. p. 209.

As little to the purpose, and not much more accurate in its rendering, is the following quotation from Bishop Bull's *Defensio Fidei Nicænæ*:—

"In hac Synodo agebatur *de Summo Capite religionis Chris-*

[5] Bp. Andrewes' Sermons, Library of Anglo Catholic Theology, vol. v. p. 93.

tianæ, nempe, de personæ Jesu Christi Servatoris nostri dignitate; sitne ille ut verus Deus colendus, an in creaturarum et rerum vero Deo subjectarum ordinem et censum redigendus. Si *in hac maximi momenti quæstione toto cœlo* errasse universos ecclesiæ rectores, erroremque suum plebi Christianæ persuasisse fingamus, quo pacto *constabit fides* Christi Domini nostri recipientis, se ad consummationem sæculi Apostolis, adeoque eorum successoribus,(nam cum promissio ad consummationem sæculi se extendat, Apostoli autem tamdiu victuri non essent, omnino Christus in Apostolorum persona censendus est etiam successores ejus muneris compellasse) adfuturum[6]?"

"Si l'on suppose que sur *un article essentiel de la foi* tous les pasteurs de l'Église sont tombés dans l'erreur, et ont pu tromper les âmes chrétiennes; comment *défendra-t-on les paroles de Jésus-Christ*, qui a promis à ses Apôtres, et par eux à leurs successeurs, d'être toujours au milieu d'eux? *promesse fausse* si les *successeurs des Apôtres avaient pu se tromper ou nous tromper.*"—Vol. i. p. 159.

Without any comment of ours, we believe, our readers will arrive with us at the conclusion, that Bishop Bull is no more a witness in this passage for the infallibility of the Romish Church, in proof of which it is quoted, than Bishop Andrewes in the preceding passage for the sacrament of Penance.

Dr. Hammond's works furnish four quotations, two taken from passages of his work on heresy, one from his Dissertations, and one from his Practical Catechism. The last of them we shall notice in another place; the former are as follows:—

"To this also my concession shall be as liberal as any Romanist can wish, that there are two ways of conveying such revelations to us, one in writing, the other by oral tradition; the former in the Gospels and other writings of the Apostles, and which make up the Sacred Writ or canon of the New Testament; the latter in the Apostles' preachings to all the Churches of their plantations, which are no where set down for us in the Sacred Writ, but conserved as *deposita* by them to whom they were entrusted. And although in sundry respects the former of these be much the more faithful, steady way of conveyance, and for want thereof many things may possibly have perished, or been changed by their passage through many hands, this much being on these grounds confessed by Bellarmine himself, that the Scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief; yet there be no less veracity in the tongues than the hands, in the preachings than the writings of the Apostles; nay, *Prior sermo quam liber, prior sensus quam stylus*, saith Tertullian,

[6] Bull, Def. Fidei Nic. Procem. §. 2.

the Apostles preached before they writ, planted Churches before they addressed epistles to them. On these grounds I make no scruple to *grant*, that Apostolical traditions, *such as are truly so*, as well as Apostolical writings, are equally the matter of *that Christian's belief, who is equally secured* by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is Apostolic writing, so the other is Apostolic tradition[7]."

"Je n'hésite pas à le *proclamer:* les traditions Apostoliques sont, comme les écrits des Apôtres, dignes du *respect des Chrétiens, assurés* par une fidèle transmission, que les écrits et les traditions viennent réellement des Apôtres."—Vol. i. p. 181, latter part of quotation.

Here, to say nothing of the superior degree of confidence which Dr. Hammond claims for Scripture, as compared with tradition, and which Cardinal Bellarmine himself admitted, the sense of the passage, even as far as it is quoted, is manifestly perverted in the translation. Dr. Hammond limits his recognition of Apostolic traditions by a most important qualification, "such as are truly so," and again, "*that* Christian's belief who is equally secured;" but that qualification altogether vanishes in the translation, in which it is assumed that all so-called Apostolic traditions are really such, and that all Christians have assurance thereof, viz.—by the fidelity of their transmission in the Roman Church, who vouches for them. The next passage furnishes two quotations:—

"Next then the inquiry must proceed by examining what is this equal way of conveyance, common to both these, upon strength of which we become obliged to receive such or such a tradition for Apostolical. And this again is acknowledged to be not by any Divine testimony: for God hath no where *affirmed in Divine Writ*, that the epistle *inscribed* of Paul the Apostle to the Romans, *consisting of so many periods* as now it is in our Bibles, was *ever* written by that Apostle, *nor are there any inward characters or signatures, or beams of light in the writing itself, that can be admitted, or pretended for testimonies of this*, any more than the like may exact to be admitted as witnesses, that the Creed called the Apostles' was

"*Dieu, par exemple*, n'a nulle part *révélé* que l'Épître de l'Apôtre St. Paul, telle qu'elle se trouve aujourd'hui dans nos Bibles, ait *réellement* été écrite par cet Apôtre. *L'Écriture elle-même ne porte pas un caractère irrécusable d'inspiration; est-elle entourée de rayons de lumière, qui en illuminent la preuve et le témoignage?*—Vol. i. p. 168.

[7] Hammond, on Heresy, ch. v. §. 3.

indeed, in the full sense of it, delivered to the Churches. It remains, then, that herein on both sides we rest content with human testimonies of undoubted authority, or such as there is not any rational motive to distrust, and of which alone the matter is capable[7]."

" Il ne nous reste d'autre ressource, que d'accepter de part et d'autre des témoignages humains d'une autorité incontestée, ou des témoignages que le sujet porte avec lui, et que nous ne saurions raisonnablement révoquer en doute."—Vol. i. p. 181, former part of quotation.

The passage from Dr. Hammond's " Dissertations" is directed against the Presbyterian allegation that Episcopacy is a corruption, which was introduced into the Church in the very first age after the Apostles. In the connexion in which Hoeninghaus introduces it, and in the form given it by his translation, it is made to appear as an admission of the antiquity and divine right of the Papal hierarchy, instead of being, as it is, a vindication of the Apostolic distinction between the Episcopate and the Presbyterate:

" *Si de universâ Christi familiâ (œconomis fidelissimis vixdum e foribus egressis) sic pronuntiandum sit, si de utriusque Testamenti* ἀποθήκαις, *a quibus (præter alias* παραδόσεις) *Sacrum Scripturæ Canonem stabilitum et conservatum nos accepisse agnoscimus, hæc et talia censenda sint,* habebunt adversarii nostri, unde *de Hierarchicis* simul *et Christianis* triumphare possint, *unde de disciplinâ, fideque integrâ, unâ mensurandis strage, eodem busto componendis, sibi affatim gratulentur.* Quid enim de Scripturarum Canone inter Protestantes *ipsosque qui se Evangelicos nuncupant,* recepto, *de Diei Dominicæ observatione aut e Scripturâ,* vel ex universo antiquitatis penu adversus ἀντιλέγοντας dici potest, quod non *multo auctius et cumulatius pro Episcopali dignitate* contra paritatis Presbyteranæ assertores dici poterit[9]?"

" *Suppose-t-on que les gardiens de l'Écriture Sainte ont changé la hiérarchie de l'Église;* nos ennemis communs triompheront *bien vite.*

Car quelles armes peut-on emprunter à l' antiquité pour convaincre ceux qui contestent le canon adopté par les Protestants, que l'on ne puisse tourner contre ceux qui soutiennent la prétendue égalité des prêtres et des évêques?" —Vol. i. p, 187.

[8] Hammond, on Heresy, ch. v. § 4.
[9] Hammond, Dissert. I. p. 50.

The next divine put under contribution is Dr. Waterland; to two of the quotations from him we shall presently refer; the other two we subjoin:

"The question is not, whether Scripture and Fathers be equally infallible? all the Fathers together are not so valuable or so credible as any one inspired writer; but it is plainly this, whether the ancient Heretics or Catholics, as they have been distinguished, have been the best interpreters of disputed texts; and whether we are now to close in with the former or with the latter? *You would insinuate that you have Scripture, and we, Fathers only; but we insist upon it that we have both; as for many other reasons, so also for this, because both, very probably, went together, and as you certainly want one, so* it is extremely probable that you have neither, for this very reason, *among many others*, because you have not both." [1]

"*Quant à l'Écriture Sainte et à la tradition*, il est très-probable que vous n'avez pour vous ni l'une ni l'autre, par la raison que vous ne les avez pas toutes les deux." —Vol. i. p. 180.

Dr. Waterland is reasoning against Dr. Clarke's heretical doctrine on the nature and person of Christ; it is with reference to this that he asserts that Scripture and tradition went together, and thence argues, that he who wants either, probably has neither. To quote what he so says on this particular subject, as a general assertion that Scripture and tradition always, or most probably, go together, and to place this pretended recognition of tradition generally as co-ordinate with Scripture, to the credit of the traditions of the Roman Church, imposed by the Creed of Pope Pius IV., deserves again no other name than that of an impudent fraud. The same moral obliquity lurks in the following quotation, in which two distinct passages from Waterland are welded together, suppressing a most important portion of the former, which, had it been inserted, would have nullified the whole as evidence in favour of the Romish doctrine of tradition.

"The admitting such a *secondary* proof, (i. e. the testimony of tradition or antiquity,) *in this case*, (i. e. the doctrine of the Trinity,) is not derogating from Scripture authority, but is confirming and strengthening it in more views

"Quand on accepte les preuves de la tradition, on ne restreint aucunement l'autorité de l'Écriture Sainte; au contraire, on la confirme, on la consolide sous plusieurs rapports, en admettant le même genre de preuves que l'on reconnaît au

[1] Vindication of Christ's Divinity. Works by Van Mildert, vol. i. Part ii. p. 325.

than one, as it is accepting the same kind of proof here, which we accept *in another case*, with respect to the canon of Scripture; and as it is corroborating the Scripture *account of the Christian faith with collateral evidences, both to illustrate and enforce it. Not that one would, at this time of day, presume to rest an article of faith upon Church records alone, or upon any thing besides Scripture; but while the superior proof from Sacred Writ is the ground of our faith, the subordinate proof from antiquity may be a good mark of direction for the interpretation of Scripture in the prime doctrines*[2]."

canon de l'Écriture Sainte, et en étayant l'Écriture sur la tradition orale. Et si l'on prétend, &c.

"If it be said, that common Christians at least can reap no benefit from *antiquity*, nor make any use of it, that will not be reason sufficient for throwing it aside, so long as the learned may. *But even common Christians do enjoy the benefit of it, if not at first hand, yet at the second, third, or fourth, and that suffices here, as well as in other cases of a weighty concernment.* How do they know, for instance, that Scripture is the word of God? They know it immediately or proximately from their proper guides, or other instructors, who in the last resort learn it from the ancients. So then, *ordinary* Christians may thus *remotely* have the use of *antiquity* (*not to mention other nearer ways*), *with respect to the sense of Scripture, as well as with regard to its authenticity; and their faith may be both strengthened and brightened by this additional reinforcement*[3]."

"Et si l'on prétend que la masse des Chrétiens *ignorants* ne tire aucun avantage de la *tradition*, ou ne peut pas en faire usage, ce n'est pas une raison pour la rejeter tant que les Chrétiens lettrés peuvent en profiter: *les ignorants n'ont qu'à gagner à cette transmission orale.*

D'où savent-ils, par exemple, que l'Écriture Sainte est la parole de Dieu? Ils le savent ou directement ou indirectement par leurs guides et maîtres qui, en dernière instance, le tiennent des anciens. Ainsi les Chrétiens *illettrés* peuvent donc profiter de la *tradition, puisqu'elle explique le sens de l'Écriture Sainte, ou en confirme l'authenticité.*"—Vol. i. pp. 181, 182.

The quotation from Dr. Cave is as follows:—

"Ce serait une grande folie que de nier, que Saint Pierre ait été à Rome, y ait fondé l'Église et l'ait glorifiée de son sang."—Vol. i. p. 236.

The quotation is one of a series strung together in support of the supremacy of the Pope as the successor of St. Peter; it is

[2] Idem, ibid. p. 272. [3] Idem, ibid. pp. 286, 287.

given as from "Cave, *Vom ersten Christenthum;*" without any further indication of the place, a fashion very usual with Hoeninghaus, and very expedient for one who quotes as he does. We thought of course we should find it in Cave's "Primitive Christianity," but after hunting for it in vain, we satisfied ourselves that no such passage existed in that work, and we then bethought ourselves of turning to his *Historia Literaria Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, where, under the article *S. Petrus*, we found, sure enough, the following lines :—

"Ex quibus verbis[4] *mente læsus sit oportet, qui alium sensum extundere queat, quam* post Christi in cœlos ascensum duodecim Apostolos per varias orbis terrarum provincias et civitates Evangelium per xxv. annos prædicasse : cumque Nero jam imperii gubernacula teneret, *Petrum* demum *Romam venisse; et fundatâ ibi Ecclesiâ crucem subiisse*[5]."

There can be little doubt that the words marked in italics are the materials from which Hoeninghaus manufactured his quotation, improving the text of Cave by rendering "*fundatâ ibi Ecclesiâ*," not as every tyro would render it, "having founded *a* Church there," but more *à la Romaine*, "having founded *the* Church there." It is hardly necessary to vindicate Dr. Cave from the suspicion of giving the least countenance to the Romish claim of supremacy; but there are, immediately below the passage quoted, or rather mutilated, by Hoeninghaus, a few lines so very much to the point, that we cannot forbear quoting them in further proof of the fact, how totally against the real evidence of our English divines the evidence is, which he culls from them in support of Rome. The passage from Cave is as follows :—

"Non immerito dubitari potest, an proprie loquendo, Petrus Romæ Episcopus dici debeat. Laxiori quidem sensu Romanum Episcopum dici posse, quatenus hujus Ecclesiæ fundamenta posuit, eamque martyrio suo illustrem reddidit, mecum opinor fatebuntur omnes tam veteres quam recentiores. *Romanæ vero Cathedræ tanquam peculiarem Episcopum affixum esse ægre patitur muneris Apostolici ratio; nec ulla nos docent primæ vetustatis monumenta*[6]."

The next quotation is from Dr. Field's work on the Church; and we cannot set its fraudulent character in a clearer light than by setting down the entire passage from which it is taken :—

"First, I profess before God, men, and angels, that I neither do, nor ever did think the present Roman Church to be the true Church whose communion we are bound to embrace; but an heretical Church

[4] A passage from *Lactantius, de mort. persecut.* c. 2. quoted by Cave.
[5] Cave, *Hist. Liter. Script. Eccl.* v. S. Petrus, c. x.
[6] Idem, ibid. c. xi.

with which we may not communicate. Secondly, I profess in like sort, that though I did, and do acknowledge the Church wherein our fathers lived before Luther's time, to have been the true Church of God in respect of the best, and indeed the principal parts thereof, which held a saving profession of the truth in Christ, (howsoever many, and they greatly prevailing, erred damnably,) yet I never thought it to be that Church in whose judgment we are to rest without any further doubt or question; nor that it was safe to follow the greater part of the guides and rulers of it; but the Church in whose judgment we must absolutely and finally rest, is that whole and entire society of holy ones, which, beginning at Jerusalem, and filling the world, continues unto this day. To refuse the judgment of this Church, or to resist any thing delivered *ab omnibus, ubique, semper*, in all places, at all times, by all *Christian pastors and people, not noted for heresy or singularity, were extreme folly and madness:* so that, as I noted in answer to the first chapter out of Waldensis, it is not any particular Church, as the Church of Africa, nor the particular Roman Church, but the Universal Church, not gathered together in a general council, which hath sometimes erred, but the whole Catholic Church dispersed through the world, from the baptism of Christ unto our times, which doth undoubtedly hold the true faith and faithful testimony of Jesus, and in whose judgment we must absolutely rest, without any further question or doubting; and hereunto agreeth Vincentius Lirinensis, prescribing this course to be followed in matters questioned, touching faith and religion. If error creep into one part of the Church, we must look unto others that still are sound and pure; if into almost the whole present Church, we must look up higher into former times, and the resolutions of them that have been since the Apostles' times. Thus I hope the reader will easily perceive that this first allegation is frivolous. For I do not think the present Church of Rome to be the true Church of God, whose communion we must embrace, nor that the particular Roman Church, when it was at the best, was that Church, in the judgment whereof we are absolutely to rest; and, therefore, let no man confine himself here without further wading into particular controversies, but let every man, as he tendereth the salvation of his own soul, look to the judgment of other Churches also, and to the resolutions of former times[7]."

"Grande folie que de s'élever contre des doctrines enseignées *ubique, semper, ab omnibus*, en tous lieux, et tout temps, et par tous, *tant qu'elles n'ont pas été reconnues comme fausses ou opposeés à la vérité.*"—Vol. i. 182.

Can any thing be more luminous, or more decided, than the

[7] Field of the Church; five Books. Appendix, Part iii. c. 4.

canons here laid down for distinguishing between Catholic truth and Romish doctrine? any thing more shameless, than to detach a sentence out of this argument, for the purpose of quoting Dr. Field as a witness for the claim of Rome to settle the standard of the faith for the Catholic world?

We now come to the quotations from THORNDIKE, five in number; the first of them is so pointless that it is not worth noticing; we give it below[8], as a fair sample of numberless common-places which are inserted in the work of Mr. Hoeninghaus, apparently for no other purpose than to make a parade of the names of the authors from which they are taken. Two others from his epilogues to the law of the Church we have been unable to verify[9]; of the remaining two, one is tacked on to the passage before quoted from Dr. Field on the Church, with a view to lead to the inference that the Roman Church is that visible Church in which alone Catholic doctrine is to be found. The passage of Thorndike is as follows:—

"That article of our creed which professeth one Catholic Church . . . either . . . signifies nothing, or it signifies that God hath founded one visible Church. That is, that He hath obliged all Churches (and all Christians, of whom all Churches consist) to hold visible communion with the whole Church, in the visible offices of God's public service; and, therefore, I am satisfied that the differences upon which we are divided, cannot be justly settled upon any terms, which any part of the whole Church shall have just cause to refuse, as inconsistent with the unity of the whole Church[1]."

"Ou l'article de foi qui reconnaît une Église universelle n'a aucune valeur, ou bien il signifie que Dieu a fondé une église visible."—Vol. i. p. 182.

How far these views of Thorndike are favourable to the idea that unity is to be restored by conformity to the Church of Rome, will best appear from the following passage, which occurs a little further on in the same treatise:—

"I confess I am convicted, that as things stand, we are not to expect any reason from the Church of Rome, and those who hold communion

[8] En prêtant notre appui aux actes personnels d' autrui, nous assumons la responsabilité des fautes qu'ils commettent.—Vol. i. p. 159.

[9] We take this opportunity of recording our regret that the library of the British Museum should be as incomplete as it is in the department of English Theological Literature. In a National Collection of this kind, surely none of the works of the leading English divines, none of the writings that have been put forth in the various controversies which have agitated the National Church at different times, should be wanting. We cannot forbear expressing a hope, that a portion of the sums recently voted by parliament will be appropriated with a view to remedy this deficiency.

[1] Thorndike, Due Way of Composing the Differences on Foot, &c. pp. 3, 4.

with it, in restoring the unity of the Church, upon such laws, as shall render the means of salvation visible to all that use them as they ought. And this, and only this, I hold to be the due ground, upon which we are enabled to provide an establishment of unity in religion among ourselves (as heretofore a reformation in religion for ourselves), without concurrence of the whole [2]."

The other quotation from Thorndike which we have been enabled to verify is this:—

"Ne souffrons pas que ceux qui traitent le Pape d' Antechrist et qui accusent les Catholiques d'idolâtrie, mènent le peuple par le nez, et lui fassent croire qu'ils sont en état de fournir la preuve de leur accusation, ce qui leur est tout-à-fait impossible."—Vol. i. p. 270.

This is not, properly speaking, a quotation at all, but an abstract, *à la Hoeninghaus*, of the commencement and the close of the section of Thorndike's "just weights and measures," entitled, "What we get by the charge of Idolatry and Antichrist," in which Thorndike insists on the inexpediency and the danger of producing arguments against Rome which cannot be substantiated; for, he says, "when a novice grounded upon this supposition" (*i. e.* the charge of idolatry and antichrist), "is forced from his ground upon remonstrance of such reasons, how ready is he *to fall into the snare of the missionaries*[3]." Indeed, throughout the whole treatise, Thorndike shows by the most powerful arguments, that it is not only unlawful, but impossible to hold Catholic communion with the Church of Rome.

The quotation from Wheatly is taken from the section of his "Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer," entitled "A prayer of Oblation proper to be added after the prayer of Consecration;" in which he expresses his regret at the transposition of that prayer from its original place to the post-communion office, in the terms following:—

"Upon the exceptions of Bucer these manual representations" (*i. e.* the laying of the hand upon the bread and the cup) "shared the same fate with the above-mentioned petition for the Descent of the Holy Ghost, being left out of king Edward's second common prayer-book, and not restored again till after the Restoration; except in the Scotch common prayer, where the same order is renewed, in which also is inserted the prayer of oblation, which by the first liturgy of king Edward is ordered to be said immediately after the prayer of consecration. Great part of this prayer, indeed, we have still in our liturgy, though thrown, I think, into an improper place, being enjoined to be said by

[2] Thorndike, Due Way of Composing the Differences on Foot, &c. p. 6.
[3] Thorndike, Just Weights and Measures, ch. ii. p. 11.

our present rubrick in that part of the office which is to be used after the people have communicated. Whereas it was always the practice of the Primitive Christians to use it as soon as the elements were consecrated. For the Holy Eucharist was, from the very first institution, esteemed and received as a proper sacrifice, and solemnly offered to God upon the altar before it was received and partaken of by the communicants. In conformity whereunto it was Bishop Overall's practice, to use the first prayer in the post-communion office between the consecration and the administering, even when it was otherwise ordered by the public liturgy[4]."

"Le Saint Sacrement de la Cène fut, dès son institution, regardé et reçu comme un sacrifice, et offert sollennellement à Dieu sur l'autel, avant d'être présenté aux communiants."—Vol. i. p. 189.

It is needless to observe, that whatever might be Wheatly's views on the undesirableness of the change in our liturgy, here adverted to, he neither himself held, nor affirmed the ancients to have held, the Holy Eucharist to be a sacrifice in that sense which is taught by the Roman Church in her doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, which is the doctrine for which Hoeninghaus attempts by the above extract to make Wheatly a witness.

As we have already been carried considerably beyond the limits which we had proposed to ourselves, in this examination of the quotations of Hoeninghaus from our English divines, we shall pass over the quotations from the three nonjuring divines. With the exception of one passage from Collier's argument for restoring the prayers for the dead in the communion office, and another in which he condemns the conduct and spirit of Knox and Calvin, they are of a similar tendency with the quotations from Bishop Patrick, from Hammond, Waterland, and Field, on the use of Christian antiquity. We shall, however, make an exception in favour of one quotation (properly speaking, three,) from Collier, as it happens to form part of a *catena*, which is intended to show by the evidence of our own divines, that we are bound to return to Rome, and which may serve as a sample of the manner in which different authors and extracts are incorporated together by Hoeninghaus:—

"I desire to know what authority any particular society of Chris-

"Je voudrais savoir de quelle autorité une fraction chrétienne

[4] Wheatly, Rational Illustration, p. 311.

tians of the sixteenth century had to desert from the custom of the Universal Church, *from early and more enlightened ages*, and which, as our author observes, were better guides, as being much *nearer the fountain's head*, than those so long behind them [5].

"It was a maxim with Luther and his adherents, to resign to nothing but a text of Scripture, of which themselves were to be the expositors. The Bible was God's, but the comment was their own. As for antiquity, they had no regard for it [6]."

"I should rather suggest a preference for Justin Martyr and Irenæus, for the Christians in Tertullian, for S. Cyprian, for Arnobius, &c. These shining lights were better judges of *the matters now in debate* [7]. They prayed for, honoured and obeyed even heathen princes; and being pure and peaceable, were much more likely to be directed by the wisdom from above [8]. I say, I should rather suggest a preference for those primitive *non-resisting* fathers, than resign to the novelties of the sixteenth century, and be governed by the tenets of those men, who, in several countries, turned the world upside down, and pressed their reformation with fire and sword. In short, to give these moderns a superiority of sense, a deeper penetration, and a more guarding conscience, than the fa-

au seizième siècle s'est éloignée des rites de l'Église universelle, et si ceux qui vinrent si long-temps après sont de meilleurs guides que ceux qui allaient puiser *aux sources mêmes* de la foi? Luther et ses partisans établirent pour maxime de n'admettre d'autre autorité en matière de croyance, que celle d'un texte de l'Écriture Sainte, dont ils se disaient les interprètes. La Bible appartenait à Dieu, mais l'interprétation du texte n'appartenait qu'à eux seuls! Quant à l'autorité de l'antiquité, ils n'y faisaient aucune attention. Je pense, moi, qu'il faut s'attacher de préférence à Justin le Martyr, à Irénée, à Tertullien, à Saint Cyprien, à Arnobe, et autres. Ces lumières brillantes de l'Église sont de meilleures autorités pour décider *des questions controversées de notre temps*.

Je le répète, je conseillerais plutôt de suivre ces pères primitifs de l'Église, *doués de tant d'aimables vertus*, que des novateurs du seizième siècle.

Attribuer à ces hommes nouveaux une supériorité d'esprit, d'intelligence et de conscience sur les pères de l'Église des deuxième, troi-

[5] Collier, Vindication of the Reasons and Defence, Part ii. p. 72. The point on which Collier argues, is the omission of Prayers for the Dead.

[6] Idem, ibid. Part ii. p. 164.

[7] Collier is not speaking of controverted points in general, but specially of Prayers for the Dead, of the mixture of water with the wine, and the use of oblatory prayer in the Holy Eucharist.

[8] It is obvious why this passage is omitted. It stands ill with the Romish supremacy over Christian princes.

thers of the second, third, and fourth centuries, *to make them thus an overbalance to antiquity*, is to have a mean opinion of those learned apologists, *of the spirit of martyrdom and the flower* of mankind. To do this, is in effect to affirm that the river runs clearest at the greatest distance from the springhead, and that truth is best discovered when supernatural light is withdrawn, and the assistance of heaven least visible [9]."

sième et quatrième siècles, prouverait à mon avis, que l'on a une bien faible opinion de ces savants apologistes et *de tous ces martyrs de la foi véritable et de la religion de Jésus-Christ, et modèles du genre humain.*

"Whether the Church, after the Apostles, was as infallible as the Apostles themselves, is quite another question. We think it very unlikely that the Apostolic Churches should not know the mind of the Apostles; or should suddenly vary from it in any matter of moment. We look upon it as highly improbable that the faith of those Churches should *so soon* run counter to any thing in Scripture; since they had *the best opportunities* of knowing what Scripture meant; were made up of wise and good men, men who would sooner die than commit any error in that kind wilfully. Upon this, we believe the concurring judgment of antiquity to be, though not infallible, yet the safest comment upon Scripture; and to have much more weight in it, than there generally is in wit and criticism; and therefore not to be rejected, where the words of Scripture will, with any propriety, bear that interpretation [1]."

Nous regardons comme invraisemblable que les Églises Apostoliques n'aient pas connu l'enseignement des Apôtres, et que dans des questions importantes elles se soient écartées tout-à-coup de la doctrine Apostolique. Il nous paraît aussi peu vraisemblable que la croyance de ces églises se soit mise dans un point quelconque en hostilité avec l'Écriture Sainte, puisqu' elles avaient *un infaillible moyen* de connaître le véritable sens d'un texte, composées qu'elles étaient d'hommes purs et sages qui auraient préféré mourir, plutôt que de commettre sciemment une erreur de cette espèce. L'accord des Églises, &c.

"It is not at all likely, that any whole Church of those early times

[9] Idem, ibid. pp. 165, 166. The omission of the last lines of the paragraph is again easily accounted for; they are inconsistent with the claim to infallibility and the miracle-mongery of modern Rome, and with the many changes she has in the course of her "development" introduced into the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

[1] Waterland, Vindication of the Divinity of Christ. Works by Van Mildert, vol. i. Part ii. pp. 324, 325. For obvious reasons, neither the doubt as to the Church's infallibility after the Apostles' times at the beginning, nor the limitation of the authority of tradition at the end, of this passage would have suited the *catena* of Mr. Hoeninghaus.

should vary from Apostolical doctrine in things of moment; but it is, morally speaking, absurd to imagine, that all the Churches should combine in the same error, and conspire together to corrupt the doctrine of Christ. This is the argument which Irenæus and Tertullian insist much upon, and triumph in, over the heretics of their times; and it is obliquely glanced upon by Hegesippus and Clemens Alexandrinus of the same second century, and by Origen also of the third. The argument was undoubtedly true and just, as it then stood, while there were no breaks in the succession of doctrine, but a perfect unanimity of the Churches all along, in the prime articles; though afterwards the force of this argument came to be obscured, and almost lost, by taking in things foreign to it, and blending it with what happened in later times. The force of it could last no longer than such unanimity lasted. I say, *while the Churches were all unanimous*[2] in the main things (as they were in Irenæus' time, and Tertullian's, and for more than a century after), that very unanimity *was a presumptive argument* that their faith was right, derived down to them from the Apostles themselves. For it *was highly unreasonable to suppose*, that *these several Churches*, very distinct from each other in place, and of different languages, *and under no common visible head*[3], should all unite in the same errors, and deviate uniformly from *their rule* at once. But that they should all agree in the same common faith, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same *common* cause, which could be no other than the *common delivery* of the same uniform *faith* and *doctrine to all the Churches*[4] by the Apostles themselves. Such unanimity could never come by chance, but must be derived from one common source; and therefore the harmony of their doctrine

L'accord des Églises sur les points d'importance du temps d'Irénée et de Tertullien, et encore plus d'un siècle après; cet accord *est la preuve* que leur foi était la véritable, et qu'elles la tenaient des Apôtres mêmes. Car *il serait insensé d'admettre* que *des Églises*, séparées entre elles par de grandes distances, et parlant diverses langues, ne se fussent entendues que pour tomber dans l'erreur, et abandonner, toutes à la fois, *la voie primitive;* au contraire, cette unité des croyances s'explique comme effet d'une cause qui n'est autre que *la tradition continue* d'une *dogmatique* uniforme et d'une *symbolique* transmises par les Apôtres mêmes. Un tel accord ne saurait être l'effet du hasard, il découle forcément d'une Source commune. Cette unité est déjà une forte preuve en faveur de la vérité de ces doctrines.

[2] Can any thing be more palpably dishonest than the quotation of the words following from Waterland, in the very face of the preceding remarks, which nullify the argument completely, as far as Romish doctrine is concerned?

[3] A shameless suppression again.

[4] Not to the one supreme church of Rome; not a "*continuous*," but a *common* delivery.

was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it[5]."

Si Irénée, Grégoire, Cyrille, Athanase, Augustin, et Chrysostome, revenaient aujourd'hui au monde, ils ne retrouveraient la société dont ils étaient membres que dans l'Église Catholique [6].

"But what if the particular Church wherein I was baptized, shall fall from its own stedfastness, and *by authority, or law*, set up that which, if it be not contrary to plain words of Scripture, is yet contrary to the doctrine or practice of the Universal Church of the *first and purest* times, what will *meekness* require me to do in that case? *Meekness will require me to be very wary in passing such judgment on that Church; but*, if the light be so clear, and the defection so palpably discernible to all, that I cannot but see and acknowledge it, and in case *it be true*, that I am *actually* convinced that the particular Church wherein I live *is departed from* the Catholic Apostolic Church, then, it being certain that the greater authority must be preferred before the lesser, and that next the Scripture the Catholic Church of the *first and purest* times, especially when the subsequent ages do also accord with that *for many hundred years*, is the greatest authority, it follows that *meekness* requires *my obedience and submission* to the Catholic Apostolic Church, *and not to the particular wherein I live, so far, I mean*, as that I am to retain that Catholic Apostolic, and not this novel, corrupt, not Catholic doc-

Si l'Église où j'ai été baptisé introduisait, *soit par l'autorité ecclésiastique, soit par l'autorité civile*, des doctrines ou des rites opposés aux doctrines et aux rites de l'Église universelle des temps primitifs, qu'exigerait alors de moi *ma conscience*, si la lumière *que j'ai appelée et conquise*, était si rayonnante, et mon apostasie si sensible et si palpable pour tout le monde, que je ne pourrais m'empêcher d'avouer l'une et l'autre? Dans le cas où je serais convaincu que l'Église à laquelle j'appartiens a *volontairement abandonné* l'Église Catholique, Apostolique; assuré que la plus grande autorité doit être préférée à une autorité inférieure, et qu'après l'Écriture Sainte l'Église Catholique des premiers temps forme la plus grande autorité, surtout lorsque les âges postérieurs s'accordent sur les mêmes doctrines; *ma conscience*, d'après le principe que je viens d'établir, exigerait *que je rentrasse* dans l'Église Catholique Apostolique, *que je la reconnusse et que je désertasse l'Église à laquelle j'appartiens*." —Vol. i. pp. 191—194.

[5] Waterland, the Importance of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity. Works by Van Mildert, vol. v. pp. 265, 266.

[6] Quoted as from "*Mémoire des Calvinistes, &c.*, 1775." We have been unable to verify this Calvinistic patch, which it must be admitted comes in with admirable effect between the sound arguments of Waterland and Hammond.

trine; and if for my doing so I fall under persecution of the rulers of that particular Church, meekness then requires me patiently to endure it, but in no case to subscribe to, or act any thing which is contrary to this Catholic doctrine[7]."

What an accumulation of mutilations and distortions of the sense of the authors quoted, does this connected passage present! the whole being appropriately wound up by a quotation, which, in its integrity, is in fact a direction to endure persecution rather than conform to the Roman Church, and which is wrested into an exhortation to return as speedily as possible to the unity of the Church in the Romish fold. Yet this is a fair sample of M. Hoeninghaus' entire performance, of that which M. Audin blushes not to describe as "a canticle to the glory of Catholicism, sung in unison by the voices of the Protestants!!" We cannot better express our judgment and our feeling upon this piece of literary and theological imposture, than by transcribing the observations made by Dr. Waterland, on the allegation by Dr. Clarke, of certain so-called "concessions" of the fathers, by which he sought to give countenance to his Arian errors.

"It should be considered that the *moral* obliquity and *turpitude* of misquoting or misrepresenting authors consists in this; that it is a means to deceive the simple, to surprise the unwary and unlearned (who must or will receive things upon trust); it is taking advantage of the blind side of human nature, laying a snare for such readers (perhaps ninety-nine in a hundred) as read not with due care and thought. I do not see but this very method of the doctor's (though he has endeavoured to lessen the scandal of it[8]) is big with all this mischief. He has indeed given notice; and wise men and scholars would have been secure enough *without* it; others will not be so *with* it; and therefore he is still to take advantage of the ignorance of one, the partiality of another, the forgetfulness of a third, the credulity, simplicity, haste and inadvertency of as many as come unprepared and unfurnished to the reading of his citations. The thing itself, you may perceive, is equally mischievous, however gilded over with specious pretences. And there is no more in it than this; *misrepresentation practised*, and, at the same time, seemingly *defended;* and (though the learned doctor does not perceive it) it is really nothing else but contriving a way how to reconcile (if possible) a *good name* and an *ill thing* together.

"It might be of ill example, should this method of citing authors (never before used by good and great men) grow into vogue. A Romanist, for instance, might, in this way, undertake to defend some of the Romish tenets. It would be easy for him to make a numerous

[7] Hammond, Practical Catechism, Book ii. sect. 1.

[8] That is, by giving notice in his preface, that we are not to take the opinions of the authors in the whole from these quotations.

collection of testimonies from the fathers [9]; and as much to the purpose as the doctor's collection is. Two inconveniences he might foresee; one to his own *character*, upon discovery; the other to his *cause*, because his own citations might be turned against him. To obviate the former, he might declare beforehand, that he did not cite places out of these authors so much to show what was the opinion of the writers themselves, as to show how naturally truthsometimes prevails by its own native clearness [1]: and to obviate the latter he might say, he alleged the *testimonies*, not as *proofs*, but as *illustrations* only. Thus the writer might seem to come off pretty handsomely; but in the meanwhile the unlearned and unthinking might be led aside by the fair show of authorities; and all the remedy left for them is, *Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur.* These are my present sentiments of the nature and tendency of this new and extraordinary method of citing; which, however, I shall be very glad to alter if I see any good reason for it. To me it seems that it ought never to be practised, though to serve the best cause in the world [2]."

It is but fair, however, to state, that Mr. Hoeninghaus has not proceeded with the same "moral obliquity and turpitude" in all his quotations from the field of English theological literature. There are two "Fathers" of the English Church, whom he treats with all due respect, whose thoughts he reproduces with the utmost fidelity as regards both the letter and the spirit of their writings. And who are they? our readers will ask naturally enough. The first of them we will introduce to them in the language of a Romanist writer, who professes to have good authority for the statements he makes.

"The edition of the letters of Atticus, which was published in London, does not bear the author's name, but we know with certainty that they were written by Lord Fitz-William, whom we must be careful to distinguish from *Earl* Fitzwilliam. A native of Ireland, where he had very large estates, he expended six thousand pounds sterling in building, in a parish of his domains, a Catholic Church, and took a pleasure in superintending the labours of the workmen. A vast store of information, with agreeable manners, joined with a noble affability, gave a wonderful charm to his conversation. He had travelled much, and during a long abode in France, had familiarized himself with our language, so as to write it with a correctness and an elegance rarely attained by foreigners. He spoke with enthusiasm of Pius the VIth, whom he had known intimately at Rome. When he

[9] A *catena* precisely such as Dr. Waterland here supposes, is actually attached to the work of Hoeninghaus; but it is feebly executed, and affords additional evidence that the compiler is as deficient in erudition as he is in common honesty.

[1] The very plea of M. Audin; see above, p. 344.

[2] Waterland, Vindication of the Divinity of Christ. Works by Van Mildert, vol. i. Part ii. pp. 315, 316.

published the letters of Atticus, he sent copies of them to Louis XVIIIth, and to all the French bishops then residing in England[3]. A respectable ecclesiastic who has furnished us with these particulars, said to him one day, while walking with him in his park at Richmond: 'My lord, one would never suppose that a Protestant could have spoken as you have done of the Roman Catholic religion.' He replied: 'God knows all.' We know not what motives prevented a man of a mind so just, of a character so upright, from returning to the bosom of that Church, to which he has paid so magnificent a homage. There are strange secrets at the bottom of the human heart. *Externally a Protestant*, Lord Fitzwilliam died in London of a stroke of apoplexy[4]."

The disparaging language in which this Lord Fitzwilliam, acknowledged by his Romanist encomiast to have been a Protestant only *externally*, speaks of the Protestant faith, and the extravagant praises which he bestows upon the Roman Church, Mr. Hoeninghaus blushes not to adduce on nine several occasions as *Protestant* evidence. But this is a mere trifle. Who, do our readers imagine, the other Protestant witness is, whose evidence Mr. Hoeninghaus reproduces in its integrity? No other than that profound divine and eminent saint, William Cobbett! While the great luminaries of our Church, the extracts from whose works we have examined, do not, all of them put together, furnish quite six pages of quotations, William Cobbett, the foul-mouthed reviler of the English Church, furnishes by himself alone upwards of thirty pages. We should like to know what the Romanists would say if a Protestant were to collect passages against their Church from the writings of Voltaire, and offer them to the world as the testimonies of a Roman Catholic witness. And yet that would be a much fairer proceeding than the allegation of the ignorant ravings of Cobbett against the English Church; for Voltaire was the pupil of the Jesuits, and lived and died in the communion of the Roman Church, to whose sacraments he was constantly admitted; which is more, we apprehend, than can be predicated of the author of the "History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland."

But enough of Messrs. Hoeninghaus and Audin, and of their ignorant and fraudulent compilation. Let us see what another Romish writer, Mr. Joseph F. P. (No. 1), whose performance, small in size, but great in pretension, is meant for the information of the people at large, has to say to our Church. The plan of this

[3] That is in 1811, when the Letters of Atticus were first published in French.

[4] The Letters of Atticus, or Protestantism and Catholicism, considered in their comparative influence on society. By the late Lord Fitz-William. Written originally in French, and now for the first time translated into English. London: Keating and Brown (the Romanist booksellers), 1826.

little compendium of confessional differences is to place, side by side, in successive chapters, the Roman Catholic and the Protestant institutions and doctrines. Thus, in chap. i., we learn, that before His reascension into heaven, Christ "founded His Church, to which He committed the treasure of the sacraments, and the deposit of His holy Gospel, and over which He appointed Peter as the visible head." This Church, which has the promise of indefectibility, says Mr. F. P. drily, "is the Roman Church." Then in chap. ii., which treats of the origin and establishment of the Protestant religion, we learn, in the first place, that a man of indomitable pride, Martin Luther, an Augustinian monk, being hurt because Pope Leo X. had committed the preaching of indulgences to the Dominicans, to the exclusion of his order, declaimed both against Dominicans and indulgences; and after having caused the most crying disorders, and the most grievous scandals, by the absurd and contradictory errors which he preached, "filled up the measure of his iniquity by seducing a nun, Catherine de Bora, whom afterwards he married publicly;" and secondly, we are informed that "John Calvin, a native of Noyon, who had been forced to quit that town, after having been branded on the shoulder in punishment for his infamous crimes, became, with shameless effrontery, the partizan of the pretended reformation of the Protestants[5]." This account of the origin of Protestantism is followed, in the next chapter, by an enumeration of the Protestant communions; they are: "Rigid, mitigated, and relaxed Lutherans, Millenarians, Infernals, Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, &c. &c.; Clancularians, Libertines, Independents, Polygamists, Quakers, Calvinists, Anglicans, &c." Though last in this curious catalogue, the "*religion Anglicane*" is, as the title indicates, made the subject of a special diatribe by our author. As might be expected, we have here an edifying abridgment of the history of the English Reformation, which is placed wholly to the account of the evil propensities of Henry VIII. At the close of his reign the author exclaims:—

> "Thus was the pillar of the truth overthrown and broken to pieces, thus was the torch of faith extinguished, in England, by the infamous passion of a king who had six wives in succession, two of which had their heads cut off by his command."—p. 243.

Under the reign of Edward VI., called by mistake Edward IV., and the primacy of Cranmer, we are told that

> "A host of preachers, both English and foreign, laid down the faith,

[5] The allusion is to the foul and long-exploded calumny of Bolsec, which in another part of the volume is reproduced *totidem verbis*, p. 38.

each in his own way. Pure Lutheranism, the doctrine of Zwingli, and the impieties of the Anabaptists, were taught. The Parliament, in order to content all the innovators, took from every sect a certain number of observances and doctrines, and out of these manufactured the Anglican religion."—p. 245.

After an expression of regret at the shortness of Mary's reign, "whose first reforms promised a happy future to the English Church," the author passes on to that of Elizabeth, and thus describes the settlement of the Reformed Church:

"Elizabeth, as a matter of fact, usurped the rights and privileges of the Papacy; she made herself a Papess, and she exercised the Papal functions with a boldness hitherto unheard of; she nominated, instituted, and deposed bishops; she presided over the synods convoked by herself; she abolished the sacrifice of the mass, all the ancient rites of the divine office, and of the administration of the sacraments, in order to substitute for them new ceremonies and new observances. The bishops, and generally speaking all who protested against these scandalous upturnings, were persecuted during this deplorable reign. Does not this narrative alone rouse the indignation of every righteous soul? Elizabeth instituted bishops and pastors of her sect, framing for herself a hierarchy of archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, in order not to confound herself with the other sects."—p. 247.

Among the further charges brought against our Church, are the removal of several books from the Bible, by act of Parliament; the insertion of numerous errors into the symbol; the alteration of the canonical form of conferring holy orders, so as to render (independently of the question of Archbishop Parker's consecration) our ordinations invalid, and the consequent extinction of the Episcopate and Presbyterate; and above all, it is alleged that "the power of reforming and correcting all errors, heresies, and abuses, of prescribing the formularies of worship and of ordination, is committed to female hands" (p. 254). The whole is wound up with an expression of pity for so many "unfortunates," whom

"Their prejudices, their passions, and their interests, retain in error; their prejudices, because the Catholic religion is known to most English people only in the black colours under which it is represented to them; their passions, because it is so painful to submit to the laws of the Roman church, after a comfortable life, such as the pretended Reformation authorises; their interests, because it is well known with what rich benefices or incomes the English ministers are endowed[6], and what

[6] In another place the author gives the following account of the "enormous revenues and the easy duties of the English clergy. If the revenues were divided

heavy fees they receive for baptisms, marriages, and burials, to the payment of which all the English, without distinction of creed, are liable." —p. 255.

Still, in spite of "our prejudices, our passions, and our interests," the author does not despair of us; far from it.

"The edifice of the Anglican religion," he says, "seems to totter on its basis; the elements which compose it are approaching their dissolution. The temporal power which understands that it cannot conscientiously enjoy the spiritual privileges which it has unjustly arrogated to itself, relaxes its hold upon the rights taken by usurpation from the true Church; it grants the Catholics more liberty, and acts conformably to its own true interest; for the sectarians of Protestantism are on principle less docile and more troublesome than the Catholics. The English government would, therefore, find in a general return to Catholicism a new guarantee for its security. This return is insensibly going forward. Conversions in England are frequent, and striking examples occur even in the upper classes [7]. This is a happy omen for the future. Any favourable circumstance may in a few years bring all England back to the bosom of the Catholic Church; let us pray for the advent of that happy day."—pp. 298, 299.

After the specimens which we have given of the qualifications of our author for enlightening the public mind of France on the state and constitution of our Church, both in point of information and of veracity, we have no doubt they will readily excuse us from following M. Joseph F. P. into the details of his arguments, or entering upon a refutation of his statements; and we will therefore dismiss him in his own words to a Protestant writer, probably M. Roussell, the author of the pamphlet, "*La Religion d'argent*," who is politely designated as "*l'auteur éhonté d'un infame libelle contre la papauté.*" It would be doing too much honour to this writer,—but no! we will not spoil the compliment by translating it, he shall have it in his own nervous style, and his native tongue—*Ce serait faire trop d'honneur à cet écrivain que de relever ses bévues historiques, ses mensonges, ses grossières et rebutantes injures.*

Let us now turn to the most vociferous of the ἀλαζόνες στρατιῶται of the Romish camp, whose note of triumph, recently

equally among all the clergy, every bishop and every pastor would receive 21,850 francs (874*l.*) per annum. Yet these clergy, like all the Protestant ministers, have no masses to read, no confessions to hear, no children to catechise, no sick to confess or minister to. What then, have they to do? to read the Bible, and a few prayers, once in every seven days."—p. 217.

[7] This was written in 1842.

sounded, has directed our attention to this department of the ultramontane literature of France, M. Jules Gondon, the author of Nos. 2 and 4 at the head of this article. M. Gondon is, as our readers are no doubt aware, one of the editors of the *Univers;* he has, as he himself tells us, kept his eye upon the movement in our Church, generally designated by the term Tractarian, ever since 1838, and has repeatedly visited England, with a view to make himself better acquainted with the state of things amongst us.

"In 1842," he says, "we visited the University of Oxford, and we had every reason to be pleased with the cordial reception and the courteous hospitality which we met with at the hands of some of its members, and among others of the celebrated Dr. Pusey, and of his learned and pious friend, the Rev. Mr. Newman."—*Mouvement religieux, préface,* p. viii.

The result of the observations which M. Gondon thus made, he communicated to the world in 1844, in a good sized octavo volume, under the title, *Du Mouvement religieux en Angleterre, ou les Progrès du Catholicisme, et le Retour de l'E'glise Anglicane à l'Unité: par un Catholique;* in the first instance, he published it anonymously, but he has since avowed himself to be the author. In justice to M. Gondon we desire at once to acknowledge that his performance differs materially from those which have hitherto occupied our attention. There is none of that gross ignorance respecting the character, the principles, and the position of our Church; none of that vulgar contempt and low abuse, which in their ignorance, Messrs. Hoeninghaus, Audin, and Joseph F. P., bestow upon her. Indeed, it is evident that his object was rather to conciliate that party in our Church, on whose Romanizing tendencies the big hopes he has conceived of her reunion with Rome are founded, though he has evidently overrated and exaggerated its strength and importance. Yet, although he speaks of our Church in a more respectful tone, he cannot suppress either the bitterness of Romish hatred against her, or the vain-glorious expectations which he entertains of Rome's speedy triumph over her; and often his language is all the more hostile and insulting, because he knows he has to do with an adversary of great power and high character.

But we will, without further preface, introduce M. Gondon to our readers. He is a thorough-going Romanist; and in recording his estimate of the character of his Church, he produces what, speaking of the evidence of some of M. Hoeninghaus's witnesses,

M. Audin, with great *naïveté* calls *des pages ravissantes de poétique impartialité*. He gives to the Roman Church the palm even of intellectual superiority:

"While the North was making way for all sorts of heresies, the Southern nations, whose good sense disposes at once of ridiculous and impracticable systems, instinctively repelled Protestantism, from an innate aversion for whatever is not rational."—*Introd.* p. xii.

We were not, we confess, prepared to hear the Roman system recommended on the ground of its "rationality," but we were still more surprised at another statement of M. Gondon's which is directly opposed to all that has hitherto been considered the historical experience of the world. The impression which certainly has gone forth, that the Roman Church is inimical to freedom, is, it appears, quite erroneous; and not only so, but the Protestant trickery which produced that impression is exploded, and

"now-a-days, that calumnies have passed away, and the truth remains, it is very well ascertained, not only that the Church has always associated herself with the independence of the nations, and with the mental efforts of bold thinkers, but that she is moreover the mother of freedom and nationality. Poland, Belgium, and Ireland, might be quoted in evidence of this. There are revolutions and agitations which are nothing else but the development of the doctrine of peace and union propounded by the Author of our faith."—*Introd.* pp. xii. xiii.

If we remember right, the Romish Church was, and where she has the opportunity, is to this day, the strenuous supporter of civil despotism, whose iron arm she is uncommonly fond of setting in action for the forcible suppression of the faintest breath of opposition against herself; but, to be sure, in countries in which the civil power is not subservient to her, where she hopes to be the gainer by the overthrow of the established government, and the subversion of social order, she can and does turn demagogue. We will not, therefore, cavil at M. Gondon's statement any further; the less so, as he seems himself to imply, that the liberalism of the Romish Church is rather a new feature in her character.

"Christianity has reached one of the solemn epochs of its existence. St. Augustine has said after St. Paul: 'There must be heresies, in order that the truth may develop itself[8].' Up to the sixteenth century it was

[8] M. Gondon does not tell us where St. Augustine propounds the "theory of development." For our part, we much doubt whether any passage can be found in

the business of the councils to aid this development in fortifying men's consciences against error. But now that the political revolutions have changed the external position of Christianity, the Church proceeds differently. Rome has suffered herself to be stripped, day by day, and privilege after privilege, of all her external power; during the general persecution set on foot against her in all the states of Europe, she has suffered herself to be stripped of those external emblems of power, in order to retire into the sanctuary, and to fulfil the august mission of reacting upon society by her virtues, her character, and her unity."—*Introd.* pp. xiii. xiv.

That is to say, if we understand M. Gondon rightly, having employed herself up to the sixteenth century in transmuting Catholic truth into Romish error, Rome has stereotyped what she conceives to be the perfection of that error at the council of Trent, for the use of all after ages; and finding it impossible to impose herself any longer upon the world by the sword of despotic power and the flames of the inquisition, she has wisely resolved on turning rational and liberal, and so trying to carry her point by dint of popularity. All we say is, let the world beware,

"*Decipiat ne te versis tamen illa figuris!*"

At all events we know the mind of Rome on this subject, and forewarned, they say, is forearmed. As regards the English Church, M. Gondon is willing at present not to deny her the place of repentance; she shall have an opportunity of throwing herself into the arms of Rome, become rational and liberal; he hopes she will embrace it, but if not, this is, by his calculation, her horoscope:

his writings that would bear such a construction. He frequently refers to the passage in question from St. Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 19, and insists on the benefit accruing to the Church from the opposition of heretics; ex. gr. "*Multa ad fidem Catholicam pertinentia, dum hæreticorum calida inquietudine exagitantur, ut adversus eos defendi possint,* ET CONSIDERANTUR DILIGENTIUS, ET INTELLIGUNTUR CLARIUS, ET INSTANTIUS PRÆDICANTUR; *et ab adversario mota quæstio* DISCENDI *exsistit occasio.*"—De Civit. Dei, l. xvi. c. 2. And again: "*Improbatio hæreticorum* FACIT EMINERE QUID ECCLESIA SENTIAT, ET QUID HABEAT SANA DOCTRINA." Confess. l. vii. c. 19. The benefit here described by St. Augustine, consists in promoting a deeper consideration, a fuller understanding, a more emphatic declaration of the doctrine of the Church, the faith once delivered to the saints, not in a "development" of that doctrine. The idea of "developing" Catholic truth, is one which was never known in the Church, it was always a note of heresy, and as such utterly repudiated by St. Augustine and the whole of the Fathers. St. Irenæus teaches us in what light such irreverent meddling with God's truth should be regarded. "*Numquid perfectam tunc cognitionem nondum habebat Petrus, quam postea adinvenerunt hi? Imperfectus igitur secundum hos Petrus, imperfecti autem et reliqui Apostoli; et oportebit eos revivis-centes horum fieri discipulos, ut et ipsi perfecti fiant. Sed hoc quidem ridiculum est.*"—Adv. Hæres. l. iii. c. 12.

"The cause of Anglican Protestantism has, in spite of its great labours in the field of exegesis, in fact, by reason of the prodigious efforts it has made, become so impoverished and so bare, that it is obliged to disavow its history; and after having disgraced itself with its own hands in the works of Cobbett, it now denies itself through the mouth of the most learned of its doctors. Feeling no longer any life circulating in its decrepit members, it appeals to Rome; it weeps over the dust of the successors of the Apostles, and protests now only against its own former protests. Anglicanism has arrived at the last throbbing of its pulse; it is the throb of agony, the death struggle, and yet at the same time, the giant effort which shakes the winding sheet, and seeks to raise the sepulchral stone that seals it to nonentity."—*Introd.* pp. xviii. xix.

We beg our readers to remember that we are not responsible for M. Gondon's confusion of tropes, nor for the inflation of his style; we simply do our duty as translators. Happily he grows more sober himself as he descends to the more practical questions involved in the issue which he contemplates.

"The great spectacle," he continues, "which the Anglican Church presents to the world, was predicted more than a century ago by Bossuet, who, speaking of the Anglicans, has said in the History of the Variations, (Book vii. 114,) 'So learned a nation will not rest . . . in this establishment; the respect for the fathers which it retains, and its curious and continual researches into antiquity will bring it back to the doctrine of the first centuries. I cannot believe that it will persist in the hatred which it has conceived against the chair of St. Peter, from wh[illegible] received Christianity. . . . The times of vengeance and illusion will pass away, and God will hear the sighs of his saints!' This prophecy of the great bishop is on the point of being realised; for the Anglican Church can no longer maintain its position, without uniting itself to the Catholic Church. That reunion would allow the property of the Church to be anew devoted to the purposes for which it was given; it would strengthen the hands of the illustrious British aristocracy which is destined to live or to succumb with the Church to which it is so closely united; it would consolidate the constitution, and put an end to all the divisions and disputes with Ireland, of which religion is the principal source. That event would paralyse the dissenting factions, and by the restoration of the ancient subdivision of Church property, the landed proprietors would find themselves relieved of a portion of the poor-rates; the middling classes and the poor would have no more church-rates to pay, and a fund would be formed for the building of churches and chapels. In one word, the Church would thus acquire the popularity which she stands in need of, and which she has so long lost. If, on the contrary, the happy prophecy of the bishop of Meaux should not be realised, it is not impossible that we might, in the course of half a century, see civil war, the Church overthrown, the

great principles on which civil and ecclesiastical property rests, forgotten, and a general confusion ensuing, which would infallibly bring the ruin of the monarchy in its train."—*Introd.* pp. xix. xx.

This, then, is the alternative which M. Gondon proposes to us; this the extremity to which the Romish Church, in alliance with the liberalism of the day, means to drive us, that we shall either throw ourselves into the arms of Rome, or else utterly perish. The grounds on which M. Gondon adventures himself upon these prognostications, are explained by him in the course of his volume; of the contents of which we will endeavour to give our readers a concise outline. In the first chapter he paints in the strongest possible colours the social miseries and embarrassments of England; the growth of immorality, the distress of the working classes, the wretchedness of the Irish peasantry, the condition of the manufacturing and mining population disclosed by Lord Ashley's inquiry, the grievances connected with the administration of the poor-law, the spread of socialism and chartism, and the excesses of the Rebeccaites; all these wounds and sores of England's political and social life are gloated upon by M. Gondon with malignant satisfaction, and reckoned up as so many counts in the indictment drawn up against the Reformation, upon which, as their cause, all our national miscarriages, past, present, and impending are charged. It is the old argument of Tenterden steeple and the Goodwin sands with a vengeance; so much so, that M. Gondon at last grows ashamed of it himself, and at the close of the chapter provides a loophole for himself, by adding:—

"Without pretending to say, that the gloomy picture now placed before the eyes of the reader is directly and exclusively the work of the Reformation, no serious doubt can remain in the mind of any one who has followed the action of Anglicanism upon the social life of Britain, that the religious revolution of the sixteenth century was the principal source of all these misfortunes."—pp. 31, 32.

Pray, will M. Gondon go back one step further in history, and tell us what was the cause of the "religious revolution" of the sixteenth century? Was it not the perversion of Christ's holy Catholic truth by the craft, the tyranny, the covetousness of Papal Rome? was it not the unexampled corruption of her hierarchy, the intolerable arrogance of her despotic sway, which trampled under foot the kings and the nations of the earth? And will M. Gondon further tell us, what fruits these same causes have produced, and still are producing, in countries where Protestantism was successfully resisted, in the Catholic kingdoms

of France, of Spain, of Portugal, yea, and under the very nose of the Pope himself, under the immediate influence of that system which M. Gondon panegyrises as the panacea of all social ills and political disorders, in wretched, distracted, disorganized, denationalized Italy?

And as we have taken the liberty of putting questions to M. Gondon, we may as well make bold to ask him one or two more, before we suffer him to escape from the indiscretions of his first chapter. How comes it to pass, that his friend O'Connell still has those millions of "the finest pisantry in the world" to support him with displays of brute strength, and to fill his pockets with "rint," if it be true that famine is of as regular recurrence in Ireland as the seasons themselves, and "year after year *decimates* its population?" (p. 12.) And how does M. Gondon account for the continuance of pauperism in England, if, as he says, the poor, who in the days of Cobbett had nothing left to support them but bread and water, have since the death of "that illustrious historian," which took place in 1835, not been allowed to taste a morsel even of bread? (p. 27.) And—we beg his pardon for troubling him with so vulgar a subject as chronology—how does he make out his appeal to history, where he says (p. 34), that England owes all its greatness to its essentially Catholic constitution, and to the happy independence which it enjoyed in the palmy days of its union with the Church of Rome? We always thought that the internal freedom and the external greatness of England dated from the impulse given to mind and enterprise, and the rise of its naval power, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and somehow or other we imagined that her reign was connected with the settlement of the Reformation. But we clearly perceive, that if the Jesuits succeed in their benevolent design to undertake the education of the rising generations, the world will have much to learn, and much to unlearn, in history as well as in religion. Meanwhile, we hope, M. Gondon will kindly bear with our ignorance.

Having sufficiently harrowed up the feelings of his readers by his description of the wretched condition to which England has been reduced by the Reformation, M. Gondon is considerate enough to allay those feelings again, by showing in the second and following chapters, how the Papacy is busily employed in pouring oil into her wounds, by the most active endeavours to propagate Popery, and to re-establish the Papal ascendancy in the land. We learn here, what some of us had before suspected, that the Emancipation Bill of 1829 was never intended by the Papists to be a final measure, but only an "instalment;" that all they then wanted, was to get the principle of the recognition of Popery by

the law of the land once admitted, and that they trusted to their own cleverness and activity, and to our supineness and good nature, for a successful working out of the consequences of that principle. We learn, upon evidence which upon that subject we can hardly venture to question, that the agitation in Ireland, so often and so decidedly repudiated by the English Romanists, is, in fact, only one of a series of measures set into operation for the accomplishment of the one great design of Rome, the overthrow of the English Church and the substitution of Popery in her place. It is for this purpose, M. Gondon assures us, that Ireland has been and still is kept in a ferment; for this purpose that the number of vicars apostolic in England was doubled in the year 1840, and the number of the inferior clergy is annually increased[9]; for this purpose that Mr. Pugin is raising Popish structures in every part of the country; that the Romish offices are celebrated with greater pomp and show; that monasteries and nunneries have been established all over England; that a number of Romish colleges and schools have been founded; and that the Catholic Institute has been set on foot, and is propagating itself by branch associations throughout the whole extent of the British empire. Nor, if we are to rely on M. Gondon's data, have these efforts been unsuccessful. At the beginning of the reign of George III. the number of Roman Catholics in England and Scotland amounted to only 60,000; in 1821 it had risen to 500,000; and in 1842 M. Gondon estimates it at between two millions and two millions and a half (p. 44); of these, he says, 300,000 are in London, where the number of conversions is from 4000 to 5000 annually (p. 78)[1]: in 1792 there were in England and Scotland thirty-five Romish places of worship, there are now 500, and among them churches on a large and magnificent scale, recently built (p. 55); the political power of the Romanist body has been greatly increased by

[9] According to the statement of M. Gondon, the number of Romanist priests in the London district was increased from 91 to 135 between 1836 and 1842 (p. 78): and from the "Catholic Directory" it appears that since the passing of the Emancipation Bill in 1829, there has been a regular progression in the increase of the Romish priesthood throughout England and Wales, amounting within 15 years to an addition of more than 50 per cent. The numbers were, in 1830, 426; in 1835, 447; in 1840, 552; in 1845, 666.

[1] We have no means of testing the accuracy of these assertions of M. Gondon; but as regards the number of conversions here stated, we hesitate not to say that it is a gross exaggeration. If the Romanists in London could make a display of from 80 to 100 new converts every week, we should not have to wait till we learned the fact second-hand from Paris. Indeed, M. Gondon himself gives a very different account of the matter in his *Conversion de soixante Ministres*, where the annual average of conversions in the whole of the London district, between the years 1837 and 1842, is stated at about six hundred.—p. 30.

the organization of the Roman Catholic electors, under the auspices of the Institute; their votes, given *en masse*, being made use of on the hustings in the same way as the votes of "the tail" in the Commons, to hold the scales between parties of nearly equal strength, and to turn them in favour of whichever party is willing to purchase victory at the price of subserviency to Rome; lastly, the parliamentary influence so acquired has paved the way for influence over the cabinet itself, some of whose members, according to M. Gondon, are in regular communication with the chiefs of the Institute, concerting with them such measures as the latter may from time to time suggest, for the extension of the rights and the removal of the grievances of the Roman Catholics.

But these are only the first faint beginnings of what we are to expect: M. Gondon's anticipations of success rise higher and higher as he proceeds. In the fifth chapter he reviews the education question; that question which has every where been made the chief means of attack on the part of the Romanists, and which has already become so prominent a feature in their aggressive movements upon our Church. The defeat of Sir James Graham's education bill of 1843, is recounted by our author in a tone of exultation; he makes no secret of the fact, that it was achieved by the joint efforts of Papists and Dissenters; the agitation got up by the schismatic preachers fills him with admiration, and Mr. Hume comes in for his meed of praise for the pious solicitude which caused him to "tremble at the idea of allowing the education of the people to fall into the hands of a clergy, who are to this day far more taken up with pounds, shillings, and pence, than with the souls entrusted to their charge." Excellent Mr. Hume! who never troubles himself about pounds, shillings, and pence; whose care is all for the souls of men! But there is no alliance which Rome eschews, if it will help to slander, to obstruct, or to destroy the true Catholic Church of Christ. M. Gondon, in the excess of his satisfaction at the fate of the ministerial measure, forgets all his Roman Catholic prejudices, and actually recognises the clerical pretensions of the teachers of dissent:—

"We must particularly note one of the circumstances of this struggle between the English ministry and that part of the population which does not profess the national worship; it is this, that every where *the clergy* gave the signal for resistance; it was under their direction that the opposition was organized. It was on the invitation of their ministers that the Dissenting sects rose up against the pretensions of the government. The ministers, *men clothed with a religious character, whose business it is to watch for the salvation of souls*, were seen calling meetings, preparing the people for the conflict, and placing their names first

on the petitions against the *liberticide* project of Sir James Graham."—pp. 161, 162.

But the Romanists proved themselves worthy of their allies, and their merit on this occasion is not lost sight of by M. Gondon:—

"The Catholic priests were not less active, nor less ardent; the Vicars Apostolic set them the example. We have already spoken of the protest signed by the Bishops of England," (we beg our readers will notice this anticipation of the style, which the bill brought in by Mr. Watson, Lord John Manners, and Mr. Bickham Escott, will, if passed, enable their Popish reverences to adopt;) "and we may add that Mgr. Wiseman, having been *privately consulted by the Minister*, handed him a memorial, explaining the grounds on which the Catholics felt it their duty to oppose the attempt made to deprive them of the liberty of teaching."—p. 162.

Their liberty of teaching, forsooth! As if any interference with that had been contemplated. Was there ever impudence equal to this? We should like to know whose liberty of teaching was interfered with by the bill of Sir James Graham. Was it not the liberty of teaching, yea, the right and the duty to teach, the rising generation, which undoubtedly belongs to the Catholic Church of Christ in this land, so long as she continues to be a national institution,—that was scandalously interfered with by the ministerial project, by attempting to force the clergy of that Church into co-operation, unnatural and unlawful, with the propagators of error, heresy, and schism; by endeavouring to introduce in this country a system of so-called national education similar to that which is already established in Ireland, which takes the oversight of the lambs of Christ's flock out of the hands of the successors of the Apostles to whom of right it belongs, and vests it in the hands of a government, whose political necessities compel it, while its love of expediency predisposes it, to be a free trader in religion, and to give to those whose business it is to poison the minds of the young with the opium of Popery, and the various drugs of Protestant dissent, the same free access to the schools, and the same public countenance, as to those whose office it is to feed them with the sincere milk of the word. If the national Church is the authorised teacher of the nation, and by consequence, the national clergy the authorised superintendents of national education, was it not a monstrous interference with their authority and their liberty, not only to restrict them in the exercise of their office of teaching, out of complaisance for the teachers of superstition and of error, but to make them by act of Parliament *ex officio* parties to the inculcation of all the erroneous

and strange doctrines, which by their ordination vows they are solemnly bound to banish and drive away? Here, indeed, there was interference, here there was a grievance; but there was nothing of which either Papists or other schismatics had any just cause to complain. Their liberty of teaching was not touched; a provision was made to allow them to teach where they had no business to teach, *i. e.* in the national schools, of which the national Church is the only rightful teacher; and as for the rest, they were left as free as ever they were to set up schools of their own, to any extent they pleased; a liberty of which, by M. Gondon's own showing, they avail themselves without the least attempt being made to interrupt them:—

"As regards schools for the children of the Catholic poor, vast establishments have been formed in London during the last four years, in which 1400 children are admitted. There are besides schools at St. John's Wood, at Islington, and at Bermondsey. In 1842, the number of Catholic children receiving gratuitous instruction in London and the suburbs, amounted to 7409. In this calculation we do not include the Sunday schools, nor private schools, which render extensive and distinguished services."—p. 78.

If this is not "liberty of teaching," we know not what is; still the Romanists are aggrieved; M. Gondon even goes the length of finding fault with the National Society for its illiberality in not providing Popish education for the Romanists. The fact is, that so long as Popery has not the power of intermeddling with the freedom of every one else, and full licence for itself to do as it pleases, Popery has, and of its very nature must have, a grievance. The same spirit of encroachment, which makes the introduction of the Bible into the "national" schools a grievance in Ireland, makes it a grievance in Algeria, aye, and more recently in France itself, that the priests are not permitted to hang up a crucifix in government schools, in which Protestant and Jewish children are receiving instruction, along with the Roman Catholics. And why, on the same principle, should not the statue of the Virgin Mary be put up in those schools of the Irish "National" Education Board, in which the majority of the children are Romanists? We fancy we hear M. Gondon exclaim: "Why not, indeed!"

M. Gondon's views and hopes are not, however, confined to popular instruction; he argues in the same chapter the question of academical education; he records with particular satisfaction the terms of the charter by which the College of St. Mary Oscott was incorporated with the London University, and in which our Queen is, strangely enough, it must be confessed, made to express her "*entire confidence* in the ability, knowledge,

and discretion" of the crafty Jesuits, to whom it seems every encouragement is to be given for spreading their mischief amongst us; he expresses his belief that the appointment of "Catholic" professors to the University of Dublin, will, ere long, be extorted from the fears of England; and that in consequence Oxford and Cambridge also will be thrown open to the Romanists. As regards the former indeed, M. Gondon tells us "he knows, on good authority, that those members of the University who are not enslaved by the prejudices of another epoch, so far from being hostile to this innovation, would, on the contrary, be disposed to hail it with the greater pleasure, as it would enable them to testify the good-will and the brotherly sentiments which they entertain towards the members of the Catholic Church." We sincerely hope that those members of the University who are "enslaved by the prejudices" of the good old times, when Popery was looked upon with wholesome abhorrence as a religious pestilence, still constitute the vast majority. After devoting to the Protestant reaction against the encroachments of Popery, a separate chapter, containing, *inter alia*, an amusing account of the May meetings at Exeter-hall, which we are sorry we have not room to transcribe for the entertainment of our readers, M. Gondon proceeds in the seventh chapter to introduce us to another feature of the great "Catholic" movement, the "social regeneration," as he terms it, of England, accomplished by the "crusade" of Father Mathew; and in the course of his narrative he fails not to recount "the homage rendered to a poor Irish friar, by one of the chiefs of Protestant England, by an Anglican Bishop." Indeed, M. Gondon commits himself to the assertion, that it was "by the urgent solicitations" of that prelate, and of several members of the English aristocracy, that Father Mathew was induced, much against his own inclination, to extend his "crusade" to England; and although M. Gondon admits that he was less successful here on the whole than in Ireland, he considers the movement to have been extremely serviceable to the cause of Popery:—

"The very fact," he says, "that an Irish Catholic priest was enabled to run all over England, surrounded with all the popularity and the marks of respect which every where accompanied the friar of Cork, was an immense step in advance. A short time before his journey to England, Father Mathew had received from the Sovereign Pontiff a testimony of his satisfaction. Gregory XVI. had raised him to the dignity of *Commissary Apostolic*. Hitherto Father Mathew had only been the Provincial of the Capuchin Order. The relations established between the Catholics and the Protestants on the occasion of the Temperance Associations, cannot fail to pave the way for farther

approaches. The power of the Catholic faith has struck the mind of the masses by the miracles which it alone was capable of operating; but we hope that it will soon win and convert the hearts."—pp. 221, 222.

So much for the discernment of those who insisted that the expedition of Father Mathew was the isolated movement of a benevolent individual, which had no connexion whatever with the Irish Repeal agitation, and the general designs of Popery. We have it in evidence, in M. Gondon's book, that it was in fact a move in the general game which the Papacy is playing against us; that he undertook his "crusade" in the character of Papal Commissary, and that its object was to produce an impression upon the masses in favour of Popery. For our own part we never doubted it.

The latter half of M. Gondon's book is occupied with what he considers the most hopeful feature in the present aspect of England—the spread of "Puseyism," as he calls it, apologizing withal for the use of the term, in the Anglican Church. To this the remaining seven chapters of his "*Mouvement religieux*" are devoted; they contain, with a separate chapter on Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, a general history of the rise and progress of the movement. As this account is nothing more than a narrative of the various incidents of the history of the "Tractarian" movement, in the colouring which M. Gondon's "Anglican brethren" would give to it, rendered occasionally more pungent by a sprinkling of the "Catholic" tone and style of the author himself, and interspersed with copious extracts from the "British Critic," and other periodicals, as well as from the different pamphlets which appeared in the course of the controversy, there is little in that part of M. Gondon's volume that would interest our readers, or that has not been already discussed, *usque ad nauseam*. The only new fact we have gathered from the perusal, is the origin of the term Puseyism, for which M. Gondon thus accounts:—

"It is not exactly known to what circumstance the preference given to the name of Dr. Pusey (for designating the party) is owing. No doubt it arose from this, that the enemies of the regenerating movement (for they have the merit of coining the appellation) found it more easy to say "Puseyism and Puseyite," than "Newmanism" or "Lookism" (?). The word is more easy to pronounce; it sounds better to the ear, and this was a great consideration to those who wished to put it into every one's mouth, and to cause it to resound every where."—p. 246.

We thank M. Gondon for these valuable hints on English articulation and euphony; and we beg to assure him that his views on this subject are not more incorrect, than the opinions he emits

on a variety of points of more serious importance. Thus, when he attributes the origin of our Articles to an assembly of laymen; when he anticipates the possibility of a revolution in England, because the English clergy consider the sponsorship of the King of Prussia, on the occasion of the Prince of Wales' baptism, a ground of forfeiture of His Royal Highness' rights to the throne of the United Kingdom; when, on the evidence of a statement made in the House of Lords, by the same prelate who is said to have invited the "crusade" of Father Mathew, he states, that if not the majority, at least a very large proportion of the clergy deny, in their hearts, those doctrines of our Articles, to which, at their ordination, they subscribe; and when he adds, that the wish to see subscription to them abolished altogether, is pressed upon the parliament daily by numberless petitioners, and supported by several bishops, we can only express our regret that M. Gondon should be so profoundly ignorant of the subjects he talks about.

The tardiness with which even the most advanced leaders of the Romanizing party moved towards Rome, which had so evidently their sympathies and their allegiance, he accounts for partly by their "ardent desire to carry the whole Anglican Church back with them to Rome," a desire which M. Gondon "firmly hopes" will be blessed with success (p. 335); and in another place he says:

"There is another consideration which will always prevent the Anglican clergy, even the most advanced among them, from separating from their Church; it is this, that if instead of labouring to regenerate England, to instruct its population, they were to abandon their mission, in order to join, under existing circumstances, the Roman Catholics, they would deliver up into the hands of the Protestant party in their Church, the magnificent monuments of antiquity which Catholicism has bequeathed to them; those abbeys, those cathedrals, those colleges, in which so many Catholic reminiscences seem to have escaped from the hammer of Puritanism, only to aid in unprotestantizing England."—p. 235.

This was written in 1842; since then, events have occurred by which a large proportion of those who so lingered in our Church have given M. Gondon the opportunity of entoning the ἰὴ παιὰν of his latest publication (No. 4), at the head of this article. On the very title-page this little performance is guilty of a most discreditable piece of equivocation. It contains an account of the defection to Rome of thirty-five clergymen of our Church, and twenty-four lay members of the two universities, which fact is set forth in the title as follows:

"CONVERSION DE SOIXANTE MINISTRES ANGLICANS," in large type, and then, in remarkably diminutive type, "*ou membres des universités anglaises*," which is again followed by the addition in large type: "ET DE CINQUANTE PERSONNES DE DISTINCTION;" the effect of the arrangement being, that the uninitiated will understand the words, "*ou membres des universités anglaises*," if they notice them at all, to be a further description of the "sixty Anglican clergymen;" more particularly, as both on the first leaf and on the back, the little book bears no other title than this: "CONVERSION DE SOIXANTE MINISTRES ANGLICANS."

But pass we on from the title-page to the performance itself. It opens with a letter from Monseigneur Wiseman to the bishops of France, on the *Mouvement Religieux de l'Angleterre*, as if the whole Isle was already "frighted from her propriety." The object of this letter, dated October, 1845, and published in the *Ami de la Religion* of November 29th, is to ask the French bishops for a "great manifestation of sympathy and of prayers for the unhappy Church of England;" a request with which the greater part of them complied by ordering a *Neuvaine* on the occasion. The letter of Dr. Wiseman is followed by a short introduction entitled, "Different causes which have contributed towards the religious regeneration of England, and the conversions which we witness; Puseyite movement, and anarchy of evangelical Protestantism." Among these causes M. Gondon enumerates the hospitable reception which the French emigrant priests met with on the shores of England during the Revolution; the consequence of which was, not only that the penal laws against the Papists were necessarily relaxed, but that the priests had opportunities afforded them of introducing their principles into the families into which they were received. Thence M. Gondon passes on to the rise of the "Tractarian" school, the history of which, and of the reaction which it caused in the public mind, he briefly recapitulates. Lastly, he adverts to the "Evangelical Alliance," which he ignorantly supposes to be the only power which remains in our Church, capable of opposing the further spread of Popery amongst us. After giving a sufficiently caustic account of its proceedings, he concludes by saying:

> "This coalition, formed in the interest of the Protestant faith held in common by persons who 'severally retain their opinions on the points of difference between them,' will naturally succumb under the weight of its own ridicule."—p. 23.

In this opinion we perfectly concur, and deeply regret that any ministers of our Church should have been found weak enough to

attempt daubing her walls with such untempered mortar. In a third section M. Gondon recapitulates the leading facts of his larger work on the progress of "Catholicism" in England since the middle of the last century; and after passing slightly over the earlier "conversions" of Digby, Pugin, and Spencer, he enters upon a more detailed history of the late "conversions," commencing with that of Mr. Sibthorp, whose name he cautiously suppresses, thereby escaping from the necessity of mentioning the untoward fact, that he who so "boldly explained the motives of his conversion," has since returned as an humble penitent to the communion of that Church which he had too hastily forsaken. Then follows an account of the proceedings against Messrs. Ward and Oakeley, with large quotations from Dr. Pusey's letters put forth at that period; and after this, in the fourth section, we are presented, after a few introductory remarks, with a list of thirty-five clergymen, twenty-four lay members of the two universities, and from fifty to sixty other individuals, chiefly relatives, wives and children, of those before mentioned, who have gone over to the Church of Rome during the last five years. The numbers in the different years are, in 1841, 2; in 1842, 10; in 1843, 13; in 1844, 13; in 1845, 68; and at the commencement of the present year, 11; to which M. Gondon tells us, must be added considerable numbers from the middle and lower classes; his list being confined to persons of station and importance in society. This catalogue is followed by four more sections filled with sundry particulars respecting the personal career of the more conspicuous of the deserters. Mr. Newman, Mr. Ward, and Mr. Oakeley, have each a section to themselves; and in the eighth section, Mr. Capes, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Seager bring up the rear. The whole is wound up by a "Conclusion," and a "Postscript," in the latter of which the author mentions that intelligence of additional conversions has reached him while his pages were passing through the press; and further gives us to understand, on the authority of "a dignitary, high placed in the Church of England," who appears to be M. Gondon's confidential correspondent, that "the conversions will not stop here; that the universities and the clergy give promise of many more; and that a great many timid minds wait, before they adopt a resolution of such magnitude, to see the result of the experience of those who have preceded them in the way of truth."

To follow M. Gondon into the details of his narrative would be manifestly tedious to our readers, who are fully acquainted with the circumstances here detailed; and for obvious reasons we shall abstain from all remark upon the personal circumstances connected with the different individuals who have had the pro-

found misfortune of falling away, let us charitably hope and pray, in many cases not irrevocably, from the truth. If we cannot suppress a feeling of indignation at the wholesale treachery to which our Church has been exposed at the hands of her sons and sworn ministers, our mind is yet more strongly moved by compassion for the sad fall in which they have been overtaken, and the depth of which, we doubt not, the more earnest and thoughtful of them will discover to their utter dismay, before they have been long in the embrace of Rome. Not a word would we willingly add to increase the pain which they cannot but feel to see their names paraded in connexion with the unseemly boasts and the bitter railings which the Romish writers are hurling at the Church by whose ministry they were grafted into Christ, and were so long supported in the communion of Christ.

But we have a word or two to say to M. Gondon, and through him to his Church. Not that we desire to be over-fastidious as to the tone which, in his exultation to see the prognostications of his former work thus far justified, he assumes in the course of his narrative, and of the reflections with which he accompanies it; we are willing to make every allowance for a little inflation of language on such an occasion. But we would have him be more careful to adhere to the truth; we would have him abstain from foolish exaggerations, as regards both the importance of the triumph which he thinks Rome has achieved, and the hopes which he conceives for the future. First of all, let us hear him as to the past. Speaking of Mr. Newman, and of the effect of his "conversion" as compared with that produced by Dr. Pusey's arguments for remaining in the Church of England, he says:—

"Example was more eloquent than argument; and religious England seemed to doubt the correctness of Dr. Pusey's views, when it saw *the most learned of its divines*, Mr. Newman, abandoning his position, in order humbly to submit himself to the authority of Rome. The resolution of Mr. Newman has thrown *one-third of the Anglican clergy* into a state of confusion. Hitherto the national Establishment had lost individuals; in the person of Mr. Newman it lost the leader of a school, a man whom a considerable party in the Church surrounded with its respect and admiration. His disciples were enthusiastically attached to him; they regulated their conduct by his, and in the hour of danger they blindly confided their destinies to him as to their ablest pilot. It is natural enough that the submission of this lofty intellect to the authority of the Church should have thrown the ranks of Puseyism into disorder; for Anglicanism possessed *neither in its Episcopate, nor in its universities, nor in its numerous clergy, any man who enjoyed, as a divine, an authority equal to his.*"—pp. 73, 74.

We advise M. Gondon not to make so very sure of the "hum-

ble submission of Mr. Newman's lofty intellect to the authority of the Roman Church." We do not believe that there is any submission in the case at all. Mr. Newman split on the rock of over-confidence in his own intellectual powers, and his extensive reading; he formed a theory for himself, with which the English Church was not found to accord, and therefore he forsook her; he joined the Roman Church, not because he abandoned his theory to throw himself at the Church's feet, (his prostrating himself before "Father Dominick, of the mother of God, Provincial of the order of the Passionist, in England," is quite another thing), but because he imagined that the Church of Rome accorded with his theory. As long as that imagination lasts, he will remain with her; but if ever that imagination should pass away—and we can see quite enough in his work on the "Development of Christian Doctrine," to anticipate that it will not last very long,—Mr. Newman will turn from the Romish Church, as he has turned from ours. Neither, therefore, is our loss, nor is the gain of Rome, nearly as great as M. Gondon flatters himself, whatever might be Mr. Newman's authority as a divine, or his influence as a leader. We have no wish to detract from Mr. Newman's high and deserved reputation as a divine of erudition; nor do we wish to underrate his influence; yet we have no hesitation in saying, that to represent him as the chief, if not only, stay of one-third of our clergy, to affirm that there is not among our bishops, in our universities, and among our clergy, a single man his equal in learning or authority as a divine, is a preposterous and ridiculous exaggeration. Not less, but if possible, more ridiculous and unfounded is the view which M. Gondon takes of the importance of the entire body of converts. We will again let him speak his own mind fully:—

"If we group the names just mentioned with those of the distinguished men who, since the conversion of Mr. Wackerbarth, have successively been admitted into the Catholic Church, two leading considerations will present themselves to our mind. On the one hand, *the most learned men which England possesses in the different branches of ecclesiastical knowledge*, who had associated together for the purpose of labouring together for the regeneration of the Anglican Church, have arrived, after long years of research and study, at this conclusion: That the Romish communion is the only one in which truth, grace, and salvation are to be found. On the other hand, we are no less struck by the heroic disinterestedness with which these men accept this conclusion, and submit to it at the sacrifice of their material interests. Whoever knows the wealth of the Anglican Church, the magnificent revenues of its benefices, the sumptuous endowments which the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge enjoy, will appreciate the value of these sacrifices."—pp. 91, 92.

To hear M. Gondon, one would suppose that the cream of erudition and talent had been taken off from the English Church by the defection of the thirty-five clergymen, and that they had been either in possession, or had had before them a certain prospect, of her choicest emoluments. But what is the real truth? As regards, first of all, the question of material sacrifices; out of the thirty-five clergymen who have gone over to Rome, there were only ten who had any ecclesiastical benefice at all, and only three who held livings of considerable value; three more were in possession of fellowships, without ecclesiastical preferment; thirteen of them were only curates, and full one-half of these had lost their curacies before they took the fatal step of separation from their Church; and nine of them, of which four were still in Deacon's orders, had no Ecclesiastical or Academic position whatever to sacrifice. Add to this, that with their notoriously unsound opinions, their chance of preferment was exceedingly small; and we shall arrive at the conclusion, that whatever personal inconvenience some of the parties might have subjected themselves to by the step they took, their sacrifice of Church preferment and emolument was not on the whole very considerable, to say nothing of the fact that the few who had such emoluments, acted scarcely with common honesty in retaining them so long after they had become in heart lieges of the Church of Rome.

As regards the other part of M. Gondon's statement, which would lead the uninitiated to suspect that all the learning of the Church of England had come out of her in a body, it is still more palpably absurd. Not a few of the "converts" are young men, whose unripe judgment and incomplete information has proved a snare to them under the too potent influence of Mr. Newman; and with the exception of Mr. Newman himself, there is actually not one among them who has occupied a commanding position in theological literature. Mr. Faber has written some pretty verses; Mr. Ward has made himself notorious by his unseemly abuse of his mother Church; Mr. Oakeley has published, besides a volume of sermons, some tracts and pamphlets, and in them has exposed either his ignorance, or his bad faith, or both, by the fallacies and anachronisms by which he endeavoured to support his positions; and Mr. Morris has the reputation of being an able orientalist; but surely no one acquainted with the theological literature of the English Church of past or present times, will imagine that the few pieces which these gentlemen have written, or the productions of Mr. Seager, Mr. Wingfield, Mr. Marshall, and Mr. Formby, or lastly, the contributions to the "Lives of the English Saints," from the pens of Messrs. Walker and Coffin, will procure for any of their names a place among the standard divines of the English Church; so far from it, we think it exceedingly possible that

several of them, with tolerably sound constitutions, will manage to survive their literary fame.

This being the case, M. Gondon himself must perceive that he has altogether miscalculated the importance of the late desertions from our Church. And if he knew, which evidently he does not, how much sound and truly Catholic principle there is left amongst us, to make head against Popish and Romanizing wiles on the one side, and against Puritanical extravagancies on the other; if he knew how many able men there are in our Church to defend those principles on every emergency against her aggressors, whose erudition is less paraded before the world, but not on that account less solid than the erudition even of the most learned among those who have left us; he would understand, that even if 350 clergymen, instead of 35, were to leave our Church, taking with them an equal proportion of learning, talent, and personal weight, still the case of our Church would be far from desperate. Indeed we must beg leave to doubt whether in his heart M. Gondon and the Romish party, whose mouthpiece he is, believe it to be as desperate as they say. The very system of exaggeration of which they are guilty, is calculated to induce this suspicion; and so is the affectation with which they deny the ecclesiastical character of our Church—not only the validity of her orders, but the very baptism ministered in her. In this the modern controversialists of the Romish school must surely know themselves to be opposed to the sentiments of some of the most illustrious divines of their own Communion, who, though they considered our Church to be in schism, did not deny her the character of a Church, and even admitted, in the event of certain historical facts (of which there is no doubt) being proved, the validity of her orders. Not only are these treated as wholly invalid by the modern emissaries of Rome; but in violation of the custom of the primitive Church, and the uniform rule of the Roman Church herself[2], they set aside our

[2] As early as the third century a controversy on this subject arose, between Stephanus, bishop of Rome, and the African Church. In that controversy the Africans insisted on the necessity of rebaptizing those who had been baptized by heretics, considering their baptism null and void. The Roman Church opposed this view, upon the ground that "it was an old custom, in regard to such, to use only prayer with imposition of hands."—Παλαιοῦ κεκρατηκότος ἔθους ἐπὶ τῶν τοιούτων, μόνῃ χρῆσθαι τῇ διὰ χειρῶν ἐπιθέσεως εὐχῇ.—*Euseb.* l. vii. c. 2. After this it was ruled at the first council of Arles, that baptism by heretics, if ministered in the name of the holy Trinity, should be held valid, and persons so baptized received into the Church by confirmation;—*Si ad Ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum Symbolum, et si perviderint eum in Patre et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur.—Concil. Arelat.* I. can. viii. On the same principle the first council of Constantinople, being the second Œcumenical Synod, decreed that the baptism of certain heretics, among them that of Arians, Macedonians, and Novatians should be held valid, and those only rebaptized who came from heretical sects whose baptism lay under just suspicion on account of their tenets.—See *Concil. Con-*

baptism by rebaptizing, *sub conditione*, those who have been baptized in our Church.

All these are symptoms of conscious weakness, indications of a bad cause. And so are the calculations on which M. Gondon founds his hopes of the ultimate overthrow of our Church, and the substitution of the Romish Church in her place. It is not to the intrinsic superiority of his Church that he trusts, so much as to the external difficulties by which he rejoices to see the Church of England surrounded:—

"It is," says an English demi-Popish correspondent of M. Gondon (probably of the Young England School), whose sentiments he adopts as his own, "precisely by the events which threaten us, that the hopes of the Catholics are confirmed; for every thing indicates that we are approaching the great day of vengeance. It is not to be denied, that not only our religious system is quaking before the ascendancy of Catholicism, but our whole social system is tottering on its foundation. Our great political parties have lost their ancient homogeneity, they are in full fusion. The power of our haughty and wealthy aristocracy is threatened in its very essence by one of those blows which Providence strikes for great purposes. Our proud industry, which has reached the apogeum of its glory, dares not to interrogate the morrow. This is what we have come to, and a few years will suffice to make old England young again, by the transformations which are now at hand. How can our Church, as by law established, the most unpopular and monstrous of our institutions, escape from these metamorphoses?'"—pp. 244, 245.

While M. Gondon and his correspondent thus gloat upon the chances of a great social crisis, the former brings, by way of "a last reflection," a charge against our Church, which on the principle, *fas est et ab hoste doceri*, we will transcribe:—

"No doubt the reader will have been surprised, that in the serious crisis to which Anglicanism is exposed, the English Church did not interfere to settle the minds, to disperse doubts, and to give sentence

stantinop. I. can. vii. Again the same rule is asserted, and that on the ground of ancient tradition, by Gregory the Great. *Ab antiqua Patrum institutione didicimus, ut qui apud hæresim in Trinitatis nomine baptizantur, cum ad Sanctam Ecclesiam redeunt, aut unctione chrismatis, aut impositione manus, aut sola professione fidei ad sinum Matris Ecclesiæ revocentur.—Gregor. Papa* I. Epist. l ix. ep. 61. *ad Episcopos Hiberniæ, vel Iberiæ.* And the fourth Lateran council complains in bitter terms of the violation of this principle on the part of the Greek Church towards the Latin, and classes such readministration of baptism, as an act of "daring presumption," among those things *quæ periculum generant animarum et ecclesiasticæ derogant honestati.—Concil. Lateran.* IV. cap. 4. It is difficult to understand how in the teeth of all this and much more evidence of a like kind which might be adduced, the Romanists can venture to rebaptize, even conditionally, those whose baptism in the name of the Holy Trinity, and upon the profession of the Apostles' Creed, is beyond all doubt. The motive, to throw a slur upon our Church in the eyes of the vulgar, is too evident to be mistaken.

between the Puseyite and Puritan parties. At one time a bishop, at another a court of law, at another an university, has taken in hand the defence of one principle, and the condemnation of its opposite. But that bishop, that law court, that university is not the Church, and their decisions remain powerless as against the anarchy which reigns in the religious society of England. Not to interfere, under such circumstances, with the full weight of her authority, is to confess her impotence, to admit, in the face of the world, that she has allowed the sceptre of authority to fall from her hand, and that she has nothing left of a Church but the name."—pp. 249, 250.

While we admit the force of these remarks, and humbly hope that considerations of this kind will, ere long, lead to a vigorous effort on the part of our Church to set her house in order; we desire to call to mind the fact, that the inaction of the Church is any thing but voluntary inaction. Indeed we cannot but consider it one of the most oppressive features in the position of our Church at this moment, that while her enemies, of every name and description, are suffered freely to deliberate upon the means which they will employ for her overthrow, she is debarred, and has been so for one hundred and thirty years, from the privilege of taking counsel with herself for her preservation. She is reproached for not having kept pace with the exigencies of the times by the very parties who keep her chained down to her institutions as they were a century and a half ago, without permitting her to alter one jot or tittle with a view to adapt her system to her altered circumstances. We are quite aware that the Papists, among others who taunt her with this fact, as if it were her own fault, will do all they can to prevent her from applying a remedy. But for all this we despair not. Whatever reproach may, justly or unjustly, be heaped upon our Church, however great trials and sufferings may be brought upon her by the malice of her enemies, will not make the cause of the Roman Church, which is intrinsically bad, one whit the better; neither will it make the cause of our Church either a bad or a hopeless cause, and that simply for this reason, because she is built upon that Rock against which, and the Church that is built on it, the gates of hell shall not prevail.

Art. V. 1.—*Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mahommedanism. By the late Rev.* Henry Martyn, *B.D., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and some of the most eminent writers of Persia, translated and explained: to which is appended an additional Tract on the same question, &c. By the Rev.* S. Lee, *A.M., &c., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge.* Cambridge: Deightons, &c., 1844. 8vo. pp. 584.

2. *A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By* John Penrose, *M.A., formerly of Corpus Christi College, Oxford.* London: Baldwin and Co., 1826. Small 8vo. pp. 356.

3. *Considerations on Miracles; containing the substance of an Article in the British Critic, on Mr. Penrose's Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By Rev.* C. W. Le Bas, *M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Shadwell, and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.* London: John Murray, 1828. Small 8vo. pp. 188.

4. *The Ecclesiastical History of M. l'Abbé Fleury, from the Second Ecumenical Council to the end of the Fourth Century, translated with notes, and an Essay on the Miracles of the Period. By the* Rev. J. H. Newman. Oxford: Parker. London: Rivingtons, 1842. (*Essay on Miracles*, pp. ccxv. *History*, pp. 400.)

5. *Lives of the English Saints*, Nos. I—XI. London: Toovey, 1844, &c.

6. *Notes on the Miracles of our Lord. By* Richard Chenevix Trench, *M.A., Vicar of Itchen Stoke, Hants, Professor of Divinity, King's College, London, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford.* London: J. W. Parker, 1846. pp. 465.

7. *Special Pleadings in the Court of Reason and Conscience, held on Sunday, March* 20, 1836, *during the Assizes at Leicester. Trial of W. O. Woolfrey and Others for Conspiracy. Taken down by Memory, short-hand writer to the Court.* Leicester: Combe and Co. London: Rivingtons, 1836. pp. 28.

Among the manifold sources of sorrow which have lately been opened to those who love the Church, there is one which must pre-eminently and peculiarly strike every thoughtful observer. We mean the unsettlement of men's minds on every subject connected with religion;—on its doctrines, its evidences, its duties, its divine origin, and its positive claims upon man's obedience. All

subjects are now often argued *ab initio*, as if there were nothing which had been established as a standing ground, from which the mighty mass of mankind might be moved, and the world thus purified by the sway of Christianity. The *ordinary* condition in which the Church finds the mind of man in regard to faith in the great truths of Christianity, will generally be an acceptance of its evidence on the grounds which have usually been sufficient to command belief, and by which the Christian religion has obtained its present hold upon mankind, and its wide dominion over so large a portion of the earth. That these grounds are essentially true, we cannot doubt; its doctrines create an impression in its favour from their divine purity, and its evidences are so happily addressed to the general sense of mankind, that they feel satisfied in resigning themselves to its guidance. They have a *general* insight into the nature of its evidence, which, although it may not be equivalent to a philosophical and searching inquiry into its validity, still gives them a sufficient assurance that they have not believed a discoverable fallacy or a cunningly devised fable. In saying this, we have no wish to weaken the argument which arises from the common consent of mankind—we mean of the great portion of the civilized world—in favour of Christianity. That argument is a *primâ facie* argument of great weight, for it proves, at all events, how happily Christianity is adapted to the wants and necessities of man. For the establishment of such a dominion as Christianity exercises over the hearts of men, something is required which shall satisfy a reasonable degree of inquiry, even among those with whom deep and metaphysical researches would be quite out of place. It is, therefore, with the greatest satisfaction that the deeper inquirer into the evidences of Christianity perceives, that while his more searching investigation is rewarded by increased confidence in his reasons for "the hope that is in him," it has pleased Providence not to lose sight of the wants of the multitude, and to gratify them with the possession of arguments based on truth and sufficient to meet their wants, while those very arguments, when further sifted, repose upon investigations too difficult for their intellectual faculties, and too complicated for the limited learning which they possess. To use an illustration, more commonly adduced in reference to another subject, the minds of men, and their capabilities for the reception of argumentative proofs, are like vessels of different capacities, but the wonderful nature and the varied fulness of truth are so adapted to their wants, that it reaches to the full measure of all without overflowing those of smaller dimensions.

If, then, this representation of the ordinary disposition of mankind towards Christianity be just, it will, surely, seem to all

thinking minds a great evil, when a faith of this simple character is unsettled. Our appreciation of the evil does not arise from any fear that the most searching investigation can ever diminish the value of the evidence for Revelation. It is simply in a *subjective* point of view that we deplore such a result. *Objectively* every new inquiry only strengthens the position of Christianity, but notwithstanding this, *subjectively* the employment of reasoning on its evidences may be injurious to a large class of minds. To pursue the illustration we have taken above, to set all intellects to this employment, would appear like attempting to force the larger measure into the smaller vessel. To minds in such a condition as we have supposed, it must be the best and the highest and the most improving occupation—not to reason on the foundations of their faith—but to go on unto perfection. Satisfied that the objects on which they have placed their hopes are the great realities of life, surely for them the highest employment is the formation or promotion of devotional habits, and the exercise of Christian graces and duties, the carrying out into practice that which they have learned to be based on truth.

If we are unwilling to see such considerations exchanged for the din of controversy, and for the necessary consequences of controversy, at all events we have the consolation of thinking, that in regard to one part of the subject, which it has become indispensable to discuss and sift with the utmost care, the blame must be cast upon those who have gone forth from us, and not on those who remain. If any irreverence be the consequence of these discussions, they who have brought upon the Church of England the necessity of the investigation, or rather of the resuscitation of a controversy almost consigned to a wholesome slumber, must bear the fearful responsibility. We mean the subject of Ecclesiastical Miracles. Within the last five years opinions have been promulgated (chiefly by those who have within the last year left the communion of the Church of England), which are so dangerous to the cause of truth, that we have felt it an imperative duty to attempt, according to the measure of our ability, to examine the foundations on which these opinions rest. The subject is one of such extreme importance, and at the same time so complicated and full of questions of so much delicacy, that it requires to be examined with the utmost calmness and circumspection, but the result of an examination so conducted, is satisfactory in the highest degree; it leaves the mind impressed with a deep conviction of the manifold wisdom and mercy of God, in placing the evidences of our faith upon a basis which cannot be shaken.

The opinions to which we allude are those which are frequently enounced in the well-known series, called "*Lives of the English*

Saints," written chiefly by Mr. Newman and his personal friends, and originally advertised as a Series to be published under his Editorship. With regard to his supervision of these performances, or his responsibility as editor of them, that question has, of course, ceased to be a matter of any interest, unless it be to ascertain the statements which he would think fit to sanction, as a means of testing his reasoning powers and his judgment. While, however, we have no wish to make him answerable for any particular statements in these volumes, we feel that we are perfectly justified in considering them as a *development*, and a very rapid development too! of the views more formally promulgated, and more cautiously argued in the "Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles," prefixed to the first volume of his Translation of Fleury. We proceed now to the consideration of the questions involved in this great inquiry. The conclusions to which Mr. Newman's remarks tend, will be stated in his own words; and we shall then examine the reasoning by which he arrives at these conclusions, and illustrate the effect they may be expected to produce, by a few citations from those books which we have ventured to call the *development* of the principles maintained on this essay.

But before we enter on the examination of Mr. Newman's opinions and his essay, we must trace by a slight sketch the history of opinions in the English Church concerning Miracles during the last century, and a portion of the present.

Mr. Newman states in the Introduction to his Essay, that many questions are brought before the reader in the history contained in the volume of Fleury, published by him, "which are apt more or less to startle those who with modern ideas commence the study of Church history generally;" and after enumerating several of these subjects, he adds, that among them all, "it seems right to bestow attention in the first place on the supernatural narratives which occur in the course of it, and of which various specimens are found in that portion of it which is now presented to the reader" (*i. e.* the first volume). Mr. Newman then proceeds to say:—

"It will naturally suggest itself to him to form some judgment upon them, and a perplexity, perhaps a painful perplexity, may ensue from the difficulty of doing so. This being the case, it is inconsiderate and almost wanton to bring such subjects before him, without making at least the attempt to assist him in disposing of them. Accordingly, the following brief remarks have been written in discharge of a sort of duty which a work of ecclesiastical history involves; not indeed without a deep sense of the arduousness of such an essay, or of the extreme incompleteness and other great defects of its execution; but at the same

time, as the writer is bound to add, without any apology at all for discussing in his own way a subject which demands discussion, and which, if any other, is an open question in the English Church, and has only during the last century been viewed in a light which he believes to be both false and dangerous to revealed religion altogether."—Introduction, p. xii.

Mr. Newman, therefore, undertook the composition of this Essay, we may presume, to introduce a more correct state of opinion on the important subject of Ecclesiastical Miracles, because he considered that "during the last century," and *only* then, "it has been viewed in a light which he believes to be both false and dangerous to revealed religion altogether." Under these circumstances it may be desirable, before addressing ourselves to the arguments and views of Mr. Newman, to review briefly the state of opinion in England concerning Miracles during the last century. In doing this, we shall however advert to a few publications of an earlier date.

From the middle of the seventeenth century the question has been agitated in this country with considerable keenness, and it has branched out into two main divisions.

1. The nature and evidence of Scripture Miracles.
2. The nature and evidence of Ecclesiastical Miracles.

With regard to the first of these questions, attempts were very early made to overthrow the evidence which Miracles afford of a Revelation from God; but the objections raised in the first instance were chiefly of a metaphysical nature. A little quarto volume is now lying before us, which contains two remarkable pamphlets, published in the year 1683. The first is entitled, "*Miracles no violations of the Laws of Nature.*" Printed for Robert Sollers, at the King's Arms and Bible, in St. Paul's Church-yard. This pamphlet (although, proh! Pudor! it was published at the *King's Arms and Bible*,) is a malicious attack on Revelation, vamped up from Hobbes and Spinosa, without the smallest acknowledgment of the sources from which it was compiled, or of the disingenuousness of patching together two discordant opinions, by omitting in the one all that contradicted the other. The greater part of the treatise is translated from Spinosa, and the argument, which is utterly worthless, depends on his views of the Laws of Nature. The other pamphlet, the title of which is, "*Miracles; Works Above and Contrary to Nature, &c.*" London: printed for Samuel Smith, at the Prince's Head, St. Paul's Church-yard, 1683; is an answer to the first, written with considerable ability and acuteness, and pointing out the sources from which the infidel publication had been derived. These pamphlets were published not long after the appearance

of "Cudworth's Intellectual System," of which the first edition appeared in 1678, and in which the question of Miracles is treated more with reference to Hobbes than to Spinosa, whose opinions Cudworth dismisses as unworthy of refutation. Mr. Trench in his enumeration of the assaults upon the Miracles, has very lucidly stated the ground on which the *Pantheistic* assault was made by Spinosa. The objection is, simply, that the Laws of Nature are immutable, and that it is incompatible with the wisdom and perfection of God to change that which He has established. We have mentioned these pamphlets, because they show the direction in which men's minds were turned at that day; and we think that Dr. Samuel Clarke, in the very acute observations on this subject which he makes in Prop. xiv. of his "*Evidence of Natural and Revealed Religion*," probably had these very pamphlets in view. His book was, as we know, mainly directed against Hobbes and Spinosa.

In 1701, Mr. (afterwards bishop) Fleetwood, published his "*Essay on Miracles, in two Discourses.*" In the first of these discourses the Miracles of Moses and the Egyptian magicians are chiefly considered. Fleetwood gives the following definition of a Miracle; "*an extraordinary operation of God, against the known course and settled Laws of Nature, appealing to the Senses.*" It will be observed that he excludes all created beings from the power of working miracles, except as delegated expressly by God. He allows the works of the enchanters to have been Miracles, but *permitted by God.* In the second part, he considers how far Miracles are a proof of any religion, and divides Miracles into *Providential* and *Evidential.* Under the former head he includes all those Miracles (such as healing diseases, &c., whether wrought in Pagan or Popish countries), which are calculated to call the attention of mankind to the overruling providence of God. *Evidential* Miracles he defines to be such as "God enables man to work in order to obtain belief, and which they know beforehand they shall work; these are such Miracles as Moses and our Saviour wrought, and other prophets, and such as we have all along been speaking of." In regard to these *Evidential* Miracles, Fleetwood insists upon the condition, that those who claim the evidence of Miracles to their doctrines, must proclaim those doctrines first, and then work the Miracle in confirmation of them. Our Lord, for example, claimed to be a teacher sent from God, and worked his Miracles in attestation of this declaration. In a posthumous work by Locke, there are a few observations, entitled, "A Discourse on Miracles," suggested by this Essay. Those observations relate chiefly to the definition of a Miracle, and the consequences deducible from it, but are not

of great weight. We find now that the question has assumed a form in which many of the points most warmly contested in the course of the ensuing century, if not satisfactorily disposed of, are, at least, fairly mooted.

These points are the credibility of Pagan and Popish miracles, and their worth as evidence; and also the question whether evil spirits have any power to work miracles. It must be stated that there was not in that day any strong disposition among Protestants to deny the truth of all miraculous accounts except those of Scripture. The writings of Dr. Cave, a man of very considerable learning, fully attest this; for although occasionally he finds it necessary to express his distrust and disbelief of the miraculous accounts of early ages, many ecclesiastical miracles (those of the fourth century especially) are related by him without the smallest suspicion of their reality. We must, however, in estimating the belief of that age, take into account the ready credit which stories of apparitions and witchcraft obtained. Even Cudworth makes use of these as arguments of primary force against Atheists, and a considerable portion of the arguments of Henry More against Atheism, in his Philosophical Works, if we remember rightly, (for we speak here from memory,) are founded upon the supernatural phenomena brought about by witchcraft.

We are not concerned at present with the absurd and blasphemous opinions of Woolston on Miracles. His attempt to resolve them all into allegorical fables, whether originally suggested by a misunderstanding of the writings of the Alexandrian fathers [1] or not, has long been consigned to merited contempt. Those who feel any interest in it, in an historical point of view, will find ample details in Leland's Deistical Writers, and some very excellent observations on Woolston, in the Introduction of Mr. Trench, to his "*Notes on the Miracles.*"

We pass at once, therefore, to the middle of the eighteenth century, which was signalized by discussions of no common vehemence on these subjects.

In 1742 David Hume published the first part of his Essays at Edinburgh, where it appears to have received a very favourable reception; this partly consoled him for the neglect which his "*Treatise on Human Nature*" had experienced, which appears to have chagrined him deeply. He, however, took courage, recast his neglected treatise, and published it while he was at Turin (about 1748), under the title of an "*Enquiry concerning Human Understanding.*" His account of its reception (in the sketch of "*My Own Life*") is as follows, "On my return from Italy I had

[1] It must always be remembered, that it is one thing to explain allegorically, and another to turn the narrative into allegory. St. Paul gives us an example of the first, but would have shrunk with horror from the last.

the mortification *to find all England in a ferment*, on account of *Dr. Middleton's* '*Free Enquiry*,' while my performance was entirely overlooked and neglected. A new edition, which had been published in London of my Essays, moral and political, met not with a much better reception."

Our object in making this quotation, is not to exhibit the mortification felt by Hume at the cold reception which his Essays met with, but to point out the effect produced by the "*Free Enquiry*" of Dr. Middleton. There can be no doubt that Dr. Middleton's was a performance of much higher pretensions than the sophistical essay of Hume, and deserved far greater attention. Nearly the whole argument of Hume might be contained in a single sentence, and the miserable fallacy on which it rests, if it was neglected at first, has received abundantly more attention than it deserved. It was a shallow argument, and it was presented in a form which made it accessible to the meanest capacity. This, perhaps, may account for the pains which have been taken to set its inconclusiveness in the strongest light. But the work of Middleton was the composition of a man of considerable learning, of great acuteness, and, one would imagine, of very bad temper[2]. The sensation it caused at first is testified by the numerous answers it received. But notwithstanding the disagreeable tone of mind in which it is written, and the hard and frequently unjustifiable attacks upon the fathers, in which it abounds, as well as what Gibbon stigmatizes as its evasions, and Douglas denounces as its unfairness, and notwithstanding the fierce opposition with which it was at first assailed, there is no doubt that it has exercised a very considerable influence on public opinion, and changed in great measure the whole state of the question in England. From that time, undoubtedly, the credit of Post-Apostolic miracles has perceptibly declined, and those who are unwilling to commit themselves to the wholesale condemnation of those maintained by Middleton, cannot resist the conviction, that much of that fabric which he attacked, crumbled to pieces under his examination. His Introductory Discourse to this "*Free Enquiry*" was published in 1747, before which time (in the prefatory matter to the *fourth* edition of his "*Letter from Rome*[3]," 1741,) he had maintained similar views, but with less elaborate arguments, and far less research. It would seem that this disbelief of Post-Apostolic miracles is the evil spirit of unbelief which Mr. Newman is

[2] We have, however, very good traditional authority for stating that in private life Middleton was a man of great kindness and urbanity. The late Master of Pembroke College (Dr. Turner) was old enough to remember the impression Dr. Middleton left of himself at Cambridge, about a dozen years after his death.

[3] The *first* edition of the "*Letter from Rome*" was published in 1729.

desirous of banishing from our Church as dangerous to the cause of religion, but, as we proceed, we shall see that he has directed far more of his argument against Bishop Douglas than against Middleton.

In 1754, after the death of Dr. Middleton, which took place in 1750, appeared the celebrated "Criterion" of Bishop (then Mr.) Douglas. Its title is, "*The Criterion; or, Miracles examined, with a view to expose the Pretensions of Pagans and Priests; to compare the Miraculous Powers recorded in the New Testament, with those said to subsist* in later times, and to show the great and material difference between them *in point of* evidence; from whence it will appear that *the former must be* TRUE, *and the latter may be* FALSE." It would appear that "Hume's Essays" had begun to make a considerable impression, and accordingly the first part of this essay is devoted to an exposure of the fallacy of Hume's argument against miracles. The book was in the form of a letter to a friend who had suffered himself to be led away into infidelity by these and similar arguments. That individual is since known to have been the intimate friend of Hume, the celebrated Dr. Adam Smith. This may, perhaps, together with the circumstance that Douglas was by birth a Scotchman, explain the length at which Hume's notions are combated. But the main part of the book is devoted to the exposure of false pretences to miracles, and to showing that the rejection of other miraculous accounts ought to bring no discredit upon the miracles of the Gospel. It is clear that we are entitled to accept the one and to reject the other, without inconsistency, if we can show (1) that the facts rest upon evidence of a different character; and (2) that, *granting the facts to be proved*, their nature is clearly different. In the first case we should be entitled to disbelieve the facts; in the second, to deny their miraculous nature. We are not here determining whether certain points are to be received, or whether certain occurrences are miraculous. We merely suggest, that as soon as a difference is pointed out between these occurrences and the miracles of Scripture, either in their evidence or their nature, there is *no inconsistency* in accepting the miracles of Scripture as evidence for the religion which our Lord promulgated, and refusing, in the other case, to believe the facts, or admit the consequences sought to be deduced from them.

Before the publication of the *Free Enquiry*, in December, 1748, the miracles which were said to be performed at the tomb of the Abbé de Paris, had attracted considerable attention in England, and some slight allusions are made to them, and to M. de Montgeron's volume in defence of them, by Dr. Middleton. But the fullest examination which these miracles received in England, was

that in Douglas's *Criterion*, in which more than one hundred pages are occupied in considering them. Dr. Middleton had brought them forward as rivals to the miraculous cures recorded in the Fathers, and Mr. Hume had dared even to compare them with the miracles of Scripture. The object of Douglas was simply to show, that while many of the cures alleged were impostures, all were not to be so classed, and the facts disbelieved: but, then, that even in those cases where no imposture was charged, there was not sufficient ground to account the cures really miraculous. This was shown by an examination of the nature of the diseases, and a comparison of them with other cures of an extraordinary but not miraculous kind. The great point was to show clearly the circumstances in which they are really distinguished from the Scripture miracles. But to this part of the subject we shall have shortly to recur, and, therefore, leave it now with this brief notice. In the year 1771, Hugh Farmer published his *Dissertation on Miracles; designed to show that they are arguments of a Divine Interposition, and absolute proofs of the Mission and Doctrine of a Prophet.* His object, which Mr. Penrose has characterized as an erroneous one, required, it is obvious, that he should absolutely deny all miraculous accounts whatever except those of Scripture. Every one is aware that Hugh Farmer, in another work, attempts to resolve all cases of demoniacal possession into ordinary diseases, and to explain the language of Scripture on this subject by the dangerous scheme of *accommodation.* In his work on miracles, he maintains that there are no instances in Scripture of miracles performed by evil spirits, and he explains the miracles of the Egyptian enchanters as delusions; and in the case of the appearance of Samuel to Saul, he inclines to the opinion that Samuel was raised beyond the expectation of the woman by a miracle of God's appointment.

In 1794, Paley published his "Evidences of the Christian Religion," which has become a standard book in our literature, and the merits of which all must acknowledge, even though they may dissent from some of the views propounded in it. The two fundamental propositions on which it is based, and the introductory remarks, are perhaps the most elaborate and complete confutation of Hume's sophistry which ever appeared; and the chapters by which they are supported, altogether form a chain of argument such as few books have ever exhibited.

It will be seen by this brief sketch of the chief publications on Miracles in England, during the 18th century, how large a share they occupied of public attention. In one respect it was, perhaps, unfortunate that so much stress was laid upon *this portion* of the evidences of Christianity, that it might seem that

the whole of the mighty fabric of evidence which God has constructed, consisted only of this one great corner-stone. This *exclusive* reference to miracles as proofs of the Divine origin of Christianity, was certainly not discouraged or diminished; but rather promoted by the publication of Paley's Evidences. It is a circumstance certainly to be regretted, and we know of no work more calculated to afford a corrective to this exclusive view than the Propædia Prophetica of Archdeacon (now Dean) Lyall, in which, although perhaps we might demur to some statements, yet the whole providential dealings of God in preparing among the Jewish people a testimony to the mission of our Lord from HIM are so beautifully illustrated, that the work forms a most valuable accession to our literature.

But this is beside our present purpose, and we shall now merely allude to three other publications expressly on Miracles, all of which were published about twenty years ago. In 1824, Professor Lee published the "*Controversial Tracts*," which passed between the late Henry Martyn and some eminent Mohammedan writers, in which some degree of new interest is infused into a subject, which would almost appear to be exhausted by the constant attention which it had now engrossed for upwards of a century. The Mohammedan writers show a far greater readiness to admit the miracle, than to receive the doctrine for which it is wrought. Mirza Ibrahim, the preceptor of all the Moolas, is inclined to argue, that whatever our Lord may have wrought, there are no proof to us of his Divine mission, because they may have proceeded from magic. Magic cures diseases, and no one can say whether a further progress in the art may not enable its votaries to raise the dead. The Western deist denies the miracle, but if he believed the miracle, would admit the proof of a Divine power; the Mohammedan infidel admits the miracle, but denies the inference! We know not whether it was the publication of these tracts, which specially called the attention of Mr. Penrose to the subject, but in 1826 his very valuable Essay on Miracles was published, and followed in the same year, by an admirable and lively review of it in the *British Critic*, written by the Rev. C. W. Le Bas, and published separately with some additions. Mr. Penrose defines a miracle, "an act above human power," and explains his reasons for excluding from it any reference to the source from which it proceeds. He combats some of the positions of Farmer, and after showing that acts above human power may possibly be in the common course of the operation of higher beings, he contends that we cannot establish as a primary position, that none but the Supreme God can work a miracle. Mr. Penrose considers under what circumstances mira-

cles can be adduced as evidence of a Divine commission, and having fully shown that Scripture miracles are pre-eminently endued with all which is requisite for this object, he proceeds to point out how far all other miraculous accounts fall short of them, and differ from them. Mr. Penrose also enters very fully into the inquiry, how far the consideration of the doctrines taught may be permitted to influence our views with regard to the miracle. In regard to the acceptance of other miracles beside those of Scripture, Mr. Penrose speaks very sensibly. He does not venture to draw so sweeping an inference, as to conclude that God has never worked any other miracles, but he sets forth very plainly the grounds upon which the miracles of Scripture have a just claim upon our attention; and he very properly observes, that "the question is not, whether we can put a general negative on all claims of miracles, except those of the Scriptures, or on any particular classes of such claims; but whether those claims assume a shape or a seriousness which reasonably entitles them to regard and attention."—p. 305. These and some further observations of Mr. Penrose on this portion of the subject, are quoted in the essay of Mr. Le Bas with entire approbation, and we cannot forbear to add, that they seem to us to be fraught with important and sensible considerations. We ought, perhaps, before concluding this brief sketch of the History of Opinions concerning Miracles, to state that in the year 1801, a translation was published of Marchetti's "Official Memoirs of the Juridical Examination into the Authenticity of the Miraculous Events, which happened at Rome in the years 1796-7, including the Decree of Approbation." (London: Keating and Brown, 1801.) This publication probably exercised but little influence on public opinion, as its circulation was chiefly confined to the Romanists, but it will be necessary in the course of our observations to make some allusion to its statements, and it is therefore mentioned here.

As a little episode in this history we might mention, towards the close of the last century, the attempt on the part of Dr. Alexander Geddes (professedly a Roman Catholic clergyman) to explain away the miracles of Scripture, and resolve them into mere natural events, a mode of proceeding then becoming fashionable among the Rationalists of Germany. Although unhappily too great an approximation to such a course was displayed in a "*History of the Jews*," published some few years ago, to which we are unwilling now to call further attention, these attempts have hitherto been looked upon with any thing but favour in England. The real end to which they must lead has been so clearly seen, that they have rather served to deter English

students from too much familiarity with German commentaries and introductions to the Scriptures, than to invite imitation.

Upon a review, then, of the chief publications, expressly relating to miracles, which have appeared in England for a period of more than 150 years, the following would seem to be the result to which we should come. The question has been argued in almost all its phases, and a difference of opinion has existed with regard to the possibility of miracles proceeding from any thing but an interposition of the Supreme God, as well as with regard to the share which the nature of the doctrines involved may be allowed to take in our investigation of the evidence; but on these points the last publications[4] which appear to express the prevailing opinion in the English Church, are written in a very temperate tone, and establish, on the whole, very sound and satisfactory conclusions[5].

The course, however, of opinion manifestly received so violent a shock in the middle of the eighteenth century, that it was long before it could recover a sound and healthy condition. Middleton attacked *all Post-Apostolic* miracles, and Hume attacked *all* miracle. The argument of Hume was a sophism, which would receive some slight countenance from any exposure of false pretensions to miracles, because it was founded on the *improbability* of miracles taking place, and the *probability* of testimony being untrue. Unjustifiable as parts of Middleton's treatise may be, it is equally true that much which he attacked was also unjustifiable, and could be accounted for on no other grounds than those of delusion and imposture. This combination of circumstances, and the further exposure of credulity and artifice, which was found in the *Criterion* of Douglas, appear in great measure to have influenced all subsequent discussions. All our writers were anxious to show that Hume's sophism could not damage the evidence for the miracles of Scripture, but they could not deny that it was entitled to some credit when applied to many cases of Post-Apostolic miracles. There was an absolute necessity to distinguish between the two cases, and if the process of examination has been unfavourable to the claims of other miracles upon our regard and attention, it must be acknowledged that it has resulted in a triumphant establishment of those of Scripture.

We confess that the more we study the subject, the more we are inclined to acknowledge that this result is essentially founded upon truth; that the Scripture miracles are placed upon a foundation which cannot be shaken, whether we believe or disbelieve

[4] Those of Mr. Penrose and Mr. Le Bas.

[5] We may also mention that a few years ago the opinion of Mr. Newman appears to have coincided with these views, if we may judge from his article in the *Encyclopedia Metropolitana.*

other miraculous narratives; and with regard to these latter, that they do not come upon us with claims to regard which can in any way be put into competition with those of Scripture. We would further add, that we think it only natural and reasonable that a difference of opinion should exist with regard to the evidence of some particular miracles, that some Protestant divines should acknowledge its force and others deny it. We now proceed at once to the consideration of the views propounded by Mr. Newman. The following is his own statement of the conclusions to which his essay tends, but in extracting it we have ventured to place some parts of it in italics :—

"It may be advisable to state in the commencement the conclusions to which the remarks which follow will be found to tend; they are such as these: that ecclesiastical miracles, that is, miracles posterior to the apostolic age, are on the whole very different in object, character, and evidence, from those of Scripture on the whole, so that the one series or family ought never to be confounded with the other; yet that the former are not, therefore, at once to be rejected; *that there was no age of miracles, after which miracles ceased; that there have been at all times true miracles and false miracles, true accounts and false accounts;* that no authoritative guide is supplied to us for drawing the line between the two; that some of the miracles reported were true miracles; that we cannot be certain how many were not true; and that, under the circumstances, the decision in particular cases is left to each individual, according to his opportunities of judging."

From this extract it would appear, that one of the great conclusions to be established by Mr. Newman's essay, is the difference in *objects*, *character, and evidence*, between ecclesiastical and Scripture miracles, but a very large portion of the essay appears to us, on the contrary, most elaborately directed to obliterate all traces of this difference. And this attempt is made in various ways. The *character* of Scripture and ecclesiastical miracles is asserted here to be different, but in p. lx. and lxi., after a sort of comparison of the mission of St. Antony, St. Martin, and St. Benedict, with that of the prophets of the Old Testament, of whom Mr. Newman calls these "great confessors or reformers," *the antitypes*, we have an enumeration of the miracles of Elisha, introduced by an observation that "much might be said of the romantic character of the prophetical miracles." After the enumeration has been made, we are quietly told,—

"Surely it is not too much to say, that after this inspired precedent there is little in ecclesiastical legends to offend as regards the *matter;* their credibility turning, first, on whether they are to be expected at all; and next, whether they are avouched on sufficient evidence."

Although, therefore, the author assures us that the difference

between Scripture and ecclesiastical miracles in their *character*, is one of the conclusions which this essay is intended to establish, we think it would hardly be possible to find language more calculated to destroy every such difference, and to place them upon a par.

But let us proceed now to another point, and see how this author deals with the difference between the two series in regard to their *evidence*. Among the ecclesiastical miracles in which the testimony to the facts is the strongest,—and in some cases it is probable unimpeachable,—by far the greater number are cases of exorcism and healing; and in the examination of such cases, Douglas has admitted the fact but denied the miracle, and endeavoured to show that the cures may be accounted for by natural causes. Mr. Newman, after quoting many passages of the Gospels, in which our Lord's miracles of healing are related without circumstantial minuteness, proceeds to say:

"It appears, then, that the two special powers which gave a character, as to our Lord's miraculous working, so to that of his Apostles after Him, were exorcism and healing; and, moreover, that there were, in matter of fact, the two gifts especially promised to the latter above other gifts. It appears, also, that if one other gift must be selected from the Gospels and Book of Acts as of greater prominence than the rest, it will be the gift of visions; so that cures, exorcisms, and visions are, on the whole, *the three distinguishing specimens of Divine power, by which our Lord authenticated to the world the religion He bestowed upon it*[6]. Now it has already been observed; that these are the very three especially claimed by the primitive Church; while as to the more stupendous miracles of raising the dead, giving sight to the blind, cleansing lepers, and the like of these, she makes profession also, but very rarely, as if after the manner of Scripture." (Pr. lxxxiii. 4.)

Now in this passage there is a statement which we cannot admit for a moment. These three gifts might be the most *frequently* exercised, or their exercise most *frequently recorded* in Scripture, but it is impossible to allow that they are the *distinguishing specimens of Divine power*, by which Christianity was *authenticated*. It would almost seem as if Divine Providence, from an anticipation of the difficulties to which *such an authentication* would have been exposed *had it stood alone*, has mercifully vouchsafed *other manifestations* of supernatural power, which could by no possibility be capable of such explanations as we are often *compelled to* give, of instances of miraculous interposition, which imply only these gifts. No reasonable explanation can be given of the raising of Lazarus, of the cure of the man born blind,

[6] The italics are ours.

examined and allowed by the enemies of our Lord, which admits the facts and denies the miracle. But it is absolutely trifling with the question to place the authentication of Christianity even upon these latter miracles alone, how stupendous soever they may be, and to leave out the Resurrection and Ascension of the Lord, and the Descent of the Holy Spirit, and the unequivocal Gift of Tongues.

But as we proceed in this part of the essay, we shall perceive still stranger attempts to confound the evidence for ecclesiastical miracles with that of Scripture. Does Douglas argue that the Jews and Gentiles professed to exorcise and cast out devils, and add that some may think this circumstance puts these feats of jugglers and impostors on the same footing of credibility with the works ascribed to Christians! Mr. Newman subjoins the inquiry, "Why not with the works ascribed to Apostles?" Again, with regard to the cures ascribed to the prayers of Christians, to the imposition of their hands, &c., in those early times, Bishop Douglas argues that they "*might, for ought we know*, be really brought about in a *natural* way, and be accounted for in the same way in which we have accounted for those ascribed to the Abbé Paris, and those attributed by the superstitious Papists to the intercession of the saints;" on which Mr. Newman remarks, "Perhaps the acute unbelievers of Corinth or Ephesus, by a parallel argument, justified their rejection of St. Paul." And thus each objection of Douglas is, as it were, met by applying it to Scripture. Whether this be more likely to raise the evidence for ecclesiastical miracles, or to lower that for Scripture, we think may safely be left to the judgment of every unprejudiced reader. We confess, that to us it is a circumstance of no common thankfulness that we are not reduced to a dependence on these miracles alone for an answer to the acute unbelievers either of Ephesus, of Corinth, or of England and France. But there is one assertion of Mr. Newman so often repeated, and yet so very far from true, that although we have already casually adverted to it, we must still call more pointed attention to its utter unsoundness. The author states in one page that these gifts, the ambiguity of which is attempted to be shown by Douglas, were the *distinguishing specimens of Divine power, by which our Lord authenticated to the world the religion He bestowed upon it.*"—p. 83. In another, that they (or rather two of them) are the *prominent external signs* of power in the history of our Lord and of his Apostles (p. 85); and lastly, in another[7], that it was by these two gifts that the Apostles

[7] The following passages may also among others be quoted as justifying our assertion: "once more; the books of Daniel and Esther are very different in com-

"*in matter of fact converted the world.*—p. lxxxvii. These repeated statements of the same circumstances (and they are not all which might be adduced) show the great stress which the author lays upon it, but we contend that it is a statement which is grounded upon more than one fallacy. In the first place, there is one great difference in the circumstances under which these miracles were performed. It is one thing to perform them among and upon professed believers, another to perform them in the midst of enemies and unbelievers. But not to insist on these differences, we deny that it was to them alone that the Apostles trusted in the conversion of the world; we acknowledge that they really were a means of awakening the attention of the world to God's presence among them, and his mission to them, but it was only as making way for a most important and stupendous revelation of God's will, testified by miracles of another character, a character liable to no suspicion, and capable of no ambiguity. And in this estimate, it is left out of the account that these very miracles were *the predicted signs* of the Messiah. There is no fallacy, we contend, more evident, than that of assigning the conversion of the world to these miracles as *the* one great means. They might be and were, one great means of *calling attention to* God's message; being stronger, as Mr. Newman intimates, as evidence to those who saw them, than to us who read of them. They are to us among those miracles of Scripture which "are received only on the credit of the system of which they form a part."—p. lv. At all events, the eternal wisdom of God has subjected us to no such trial of our faith as to trust to these alone.

Without any desire to press unfairly on the author, we must point out the very great difference in the two cases. Those miracles in Scripture, the evidence of which rests to us on the credit of the others, were a great means, we acknowledge, of obtaining attention to God's great message to mankind, which was attested by *other* miracles of an entirely unambiguous kind, furnished with evidence which reaches in undiminished strength to the end of time. On the contrary, the strength of the case of ecclesiastical miracles lies almost entirely in those of this ambiguous class. This simple statement will, we trust, be sufficient

position and style from the earlier portions of the sacred volume, and present a view of the miraculous dealings of the Almighty with His Church, *very much resembling* what we disparage in ecclesiastical legends, or again in the historical portions of the Apocrypha, as poetical or dramatic."—p. lxii.

"If the miracles of Church history cannot be defended by the arguments of Leslie, Lyttelton, Paley, or Douglas, how many of the Scripture miracles satisfy their conditions?"—p. xvii.

to show that those inquirers who desire to follow the truth, will place a broad boundary line between the two, and not allow such representations as these to obliterate it. Mr. Newman professes to establish such a line, but we have seen how the course of his reasoning tends altogether to a different conclusion. And if we acknowledge that this difference has been brought forward more prominently within the last century, let it be remembered that it was a matter of necessity. The Treatise of Middleton was in some respects a gratuitous attack on ecclesiastical miracles; but the work of Douglas was imperatively called for by the Essay of Hume, and by the use which was made of the alleged miracles at the tomb of the Abbé Paris.

We now proceed to another branch of the argument.

Mr. Newman, in the beginning of Section IV., enters on the consideration of the manner in which the argument of Hume has been treated by his opponents, and endeavours to show that his maxim has influenced them in their rejection of ecclesiastical miracles, after they have discarded it as applied to those of Scripture. Douglas [8] is the writer whom he selects more particularly for animadversion, and while he complains of his incredulity in regard to all ecclesiastical miracles, attempts to show that it is unreasonable. He observes of Protestant writers generally, on this point, that

> "Though they are earnest in their protest against Hume's summary rejection of all miraculous histories whatever, they make admissions, which only do not tell against the principal Scripture miracles, and tell against all others. They tacitly grant that the antecedent improbability of miracles is so great, that it can only be overcome by the strongest and most overpowering evidence; that second best evidence does not even tend to prove them; that they are absolutely incredible up to the moment that all doubt is decisively set at rest . . . . . that they may be treated altogether as fictions, till they are clearly proved to be truths."—p. 67.

The author then proceeds to observe, "It looks like a mere truism to say, that a fact is not *disproved* because it is not *proved*," &c. A statement in which we fully concur; and if it be applied *merely* to modify the positive manner in which Douglas *sometimes* concludes the *falsehood* of the story from the *insufficiency* of the evidence, we are ready at once to acknowledge its justice. But we cannot assign to it the degree of weight which it deserves, without coupling it with what its author, no

[8] Leslie is among the number of those whom Mr. Newman quotes in this section as *criteria* of matters of fact; but of course *his* criteria, being antecedent to Hume, have nothing to do with the views which Hume sent abroad.

doubt, would call another "truism," which is to this effect; "Although the facts are not *disproved* because they are not *proved*," yet till they are *proved*, they do not come forward with any *claim* on our belief. Mr. Newman will indeed assure us that they have a claim, as we shall shortly see, because they have, in his view, an *antecedent probability*. But in the estimate here given of the opinions of Douglas, we think great injustice is done to him. He uses these strong expressions in some parts of his work, and some allowance must be made for a person who has been occupied in the consideration of numerous accounts where miracles are claimed, which after all may and ought to be explained by natural causes. The constant recurrence of such a phenomenon is apt to lead to a great suspicion that it is so general as to be almost universal, unless some strong grounds for exemption shall appear in any particular case. It has been seen that such grounds do occur in Scripture miracles; those which might in their nature be liable to this ambiguity, are clearly evidenced to be miracles, because they are found in an inspired narrative of circumstances which are plainly and unequivocally miraculous. They are part of a dispensation proved, independently of them, to be miraculous, and, therefore, are in a totally different condition from those of the same class, which are the only vouchers for the occurrence of miracles. One cannot fail to see that such investigations as Douglas was obliged to enter into, would infuse a suspicion in many cases, where previously he might have been willing to acquiesce; but Mr. Newman appears to us in the following passage to treat Douglas with unfairness:—

"Now these passages from Douglas have been drawn out, not with a view of criticising him, but in order to direct attention to the fact which he illustrates, viz., that our feeling towards the ecclesiastical miracles turns much less on the evidence producible for them, than on our view concerning their antecedent probability. If we think such interpositions of Providence likely, or not unlikely, there is quite enough evidence existing to convince us that they really do occur; if we think them as unlikely as they appear to Douglas, Middleton, and others, then even evidence, as great as that which is producible for the miracles of Scripture, would not be too much, nay, perhaps not enough, to conquer an inveterate, deep-rooted, and (as it may be called) ethical incredulity."

In regard to Douglas, it seems hard that this judgment should be passed on him for writing a book, the express object of which is to show that the evidence for Scripture miracles infallibly proves their reality, and that the evidence for other miracles does not; it is hard, we say, to turn round on Douglas, and say that

Scripture evidence would not be enough to convince him in another case, when his whole object is to prove that it is so strong that it *must* be received! But this is not all; it would appear from this extract that Douglas is so hard and incredulous, that no miraculous interposition since the times of the Apostles can possibly find an entrance into his circle of belief. And yet, towards the conclusion of his treatise, Douglas expressly declares the contrary, for, after dividing miracles into two sorts, "either events brought about by God's immediate invisible interposition, or works performed by the agency of men made use of as his instruments," he states that the "controversy" (between Middleton and his opponents) "doth not at all relate to miracles of invisible agency." He then adds, "Had Dr. Middleton maintained that there have been no such interpositions of Providence since the times of the Gospel, he could have been refuted by the meanest of his antagonists." Douglas then specifies some instances of such interposition, especially the constancy of the martyrs, which he attributes to God's invisible agency, but places these *personal* assistances, and in general, the visions, revelations, &c., of those ages, out of the way, as being but little to his purpose, "because, however certain the persons to whom they were granted might be of their reality, they are of a nature not capable of being supported by testimony, and consequently, properly speaking, not miraculous; to us, at the least, it cannot be made to appear so."—pp. 365, 366. He then instances the defeat of Julian's attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem as a signal interposition of Providence, so proved by testimony, "that he who denies it will scarcely be able to assign a reason for admitting the certainty of any distant fact."—p. 367. Neither this, nor the language of Douglas a little further on (p. 386), where he says—"Thus much with regard to the miraculous powers of the three first ages; but if there should be room for allowing (and I am far from denying this) that these ought, in justice, to be distinguished from the more modern and more suspicious pretensions of Popery, surely this favourable opinion cannot be extended, by any one who hath examined the subject, to the claims of the fourth and fifth centuries,"—is consistent with a character of obstinate incredulity, such as Mr. Newman would seem here to attribute to him.

But although justice to Bishop Douglas required this elucidation of his views, we must not evade the great question which is here opened. Mr. Newman, in the passage just cited, seems to intimate that the question of the existence of miracles is settled rather by our "views concerning their antecedent probability," than by the evidence producible for them. If we make a practi-

cal application of this statement, it seems almost like a truism. The man who believes these miracles probable, will, of course, be satisfied with evidence of a less cogent character than he who deems them improbable. From the very nature of our minds it must be so; and in point of fact, in this, and all similar cases, we find it to be so. We suppose the evidence which satisfied our forefathers of the reality of the mysterious agency of witchcraft, would fail to convince the present generation. The stories concerning the evil eye, which are unquestioned and undoubted proofs to a Neapolitan of the reasonableness of that fear which he entertains of the *Jettatura*, would, in all probability, be insufficient to bring our countrymen under its influence; and even ocular demonstration does not bar the Protestant from denying that the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius is a miracle.

All this is true, but it seems to us quite beside the purpose, except as a mere passing remark, in a dissertation on miracles. The evidence for their occurrence is surely capable of being drawn out, objectively, without any reference to subjective prepossessions, and we contend that on the strength of that evidence, so drawn out, our decision ought to be founded. In estimating this evidence, we do not deny that their antecedent probability forms an argument. If it can be fairly shown, let it have its due weight, it is then objective argument. If it can be shown, *à priori*, that it is probable that miracles should last to the end of time, that is a species of evidence in their favour, but it must be shown *independently*, or we shall be proving their probability by assuming their occurrence, and then arguing their occurrence by their antecedent probability. Thus if we compare the *Ecclesiastical* miracles with the *Prophetical*, and consider that these two economies answer to each other, both in a general semblance and in their position in the two covenants[9], we are preparing the way, no doubt, towards establishing an antecedent probability in their favour, but it is by *assuming their occurrence*. It is obvious that it is necessary, therefore, to consider the question of this antecedent probability with great care. And in treating this part of the subject, we think that Mr. Newman has unconsciously, we doubt not, in some degree laid himself open to the charge of arguing in a circle. Although apparently only answering an objection against the Ecclesiastical miracles, as fantastical and absurd, he has, in the early part of this essay, contrived to work up the argument of analogy into something like a positive presumption in favour of their occurrence. In the first place,

[9] See Mr. Newman's Essay, p. lxii.

after alluding to the great *variety* in the works of nature, especially in the animal kingdom, Mr. Newman makes some remarks on the surprise with which persons view, after some interval, or for the first time, the exhibition of a menagerie. "They have been accustomed to identify the wonder-working hand of God with the specimens of its exercise which they see around them;" they are accustomed to domestic animals, and although they have read of wild beasts, the reality seems too strange for them. And much of the same class, he then intimates, may be the variety in the works of God as displayed in miracles. The miracles of Scripture in this comparison answer to the tame animals, and the ecclesiastical legends to the menagerie, and the variety of nature is made "antecedently a reason for expecting a variety in a supernatural agency, if it be introduced."—p. l. "There is far greater difference," we are told, "between the appearance of a horse, or an eagle, and a monkey, or a lion and a mouse, as they meet our eye, than between the most august of the Divine manifestations in Scripture, and the meanest and most fanciful of those legends which we are accustomed, without further examination, to cast aside."—p. xlix. We cannot admit the cogency, though we may admire the ingenuity of this analogy. It has been very much the fashion among those who estimate Mr. Newman most highly, to compare him to the great thinker of the last century, Bishop Butler, but we apprehend it will not be on account of this analogy. It might, perhaps, occur to a maliciously-minded person to pursue the analogy a little further. Instead of being brought into a real menagerie of living animals, where there can scarcely be any deception, let us suppose the stranger introduced into a museum of stuffed or dried specimens, and to have an opportunity of examining their structure. Suppose upon examining a great many of them, he should find that they were *made up*, that the head of one species was accommodated with the tail or the legs of another, and such pranks of the imagination played, that Mermaids and Centaurs were quite ordinary exhibitions in the cases of this museum, we certainly think that his credit in the genuineness of the collection generally would be considerably shaken. And those who, like Douglas, were obliged to anatomize a great many specimens, have perhaps found this result.

But to proceed with our argument. Mr. Newman then argues that "the miracles of Scripture are a greater innovation on the economy of nature, than the miracles of the Church upon the economy of Scripture" (p. 53): and very properly warns us against condemning the miracles of the Church by an *à priori* argument of propriety, and intimates that they who have done so, have

before now condemned the notion of a miracle altogether, as a barbarous and unphilosophical notion[1]. We are quite willing to concede to the author what he elsewhere observes, that the Scripture miracles have borne the brunt of this presumption, and that they have altogether destroyed the edge of the weapon as *an argument against miracles as miracles;* but this admission leaves it quite open to us to believe that they are rare, and to think that there is an improbability about them which it requires strong evidence to overcome.

But leaving this out of the question, let us see the next stage in the presumption which Mr. Newman is here building up, in favour of these ecclesiastical miracles. We are next told that "the question has hitherto been argued on the admission, that a distinct line can be drawn in point of character and circumstances, between the miracles of Scripture and of Church history; but this is by no means the case[2]." And Mr. Newman then enumerates some ecclesiastical miracles as awful in their character, and as momentous in their effects as those of Scripture; and on the other hand, points out some of those in Scripture which seem most nearly to approach the character of the legendary miracles. The only answer to this is, we think, that man must feel his utter inadequacy to assign the objects for which a miracle might be wrought by God; or to judge *what* miracles would be proper in each case; and that he flies to the examination of evidence, as the ground of his judgment, with thankfulness to God that He has endued him with faculties fitted at least for that purpose. It is impossible to help feeling, of course, that some occasions would naturally appear to him more likely to call them forth, and some miracles more unlikely to occur, but he soon learns that the whole question is too great for him, and that he must approach it with profound humility and distrust of his own powers. Those miracles of Scripture which appear "difficult" to him, he finds in an inspired record of God's dealings with mankind, furnished with undoubted evidence of having come from God, and he studies that book to learn the ways of God; where he is permitted to understand, he feels his mind expanded and enlarged; where he sees but dimly and darkly, he is but gently reminded of his feebleness and ignorance. Mr. Newman then draws out a sort of comparison between the two series of miracles, with a view to show their connexion and intermixture; but this we only mention in a cursory way,

[1] See above in our allusions to Spinosa, p. 400.

[2] We should be sorry to urge here upon Mr. Newman the necessity of abiding by one alternative or the other. If the two series are alike, the argument from the variety of nature is out of place. But we should not press this consideration, because the nature of each series is mixed, as the author afterwards points out.

in order that we may hasten to the last stage in this process of accumulation. The author, lastly, intimates that the ecclesiastical miracles have an assignable place in God's dealings. "There exists," he tells us, "a sort of analogy between the ecclesiastical and evangelical histories, and the prophetical and Mosaic. The prophetical and ecclesiastical are each in its place a sort of supplement to the supernatural manifestations with which the respective dispensations open, and present a similar internal character." The analogy is further pursued; for as miraculous powers seemed to be revived in the prophets, though miraculous interpositions had never wholly ceased[3], and as they revived in Elijah and Elisha, —so the gift of miracles was restricted in the first centuries, compared with the exuberant exercise recorded of it in the fourth and fifth, when it was revived in special connexion with the ascetics and solitaries. This comparison is carried on at a length which it would be inconvenient and unnecessary to detail, but it ends with a statement which might have warned us of the road on which the author was then travelling. He says, that if it be urged "that the ecclesiastical miracles virtually form a new dispensation, we need not deny it *in the sense* in which the prophetical miracles are distinct from the Mosaic, not as repealing the law, but as a new exhibition of that supernatural Presence, which overshadowed Israel from first to last."

"And it may be added," Mr. Newman proceeds, "that as a gradual revelation of Gospel truth accompanied the miracles of the prophets, so to those who admit the Catholic doctrines as enunciated in the creed, and commented on by the fathers, the subsequent expansion and variation of supernatural agency in the Church, instead of suggesting difficulties, will seem but parallel, as they are contemporaneous to the developments, additions, and changes in dogmatic statements, which have occurred between the Apostolic and the present age, and which are but a result and evidence of life."

It would be very desirable in analyzing these notions, to be distinctly informed of the relative positions of doctrines and miracles; to know which of the two is to be accepted as a voucher for the other. It has pleased God in giving us a revelation, to furnish it with evidence which brings it home to us, and when the evidence is admitted the doctrines must be received; and we conclude that if any new Gospel was to be preached, it would be provided with evidence as unexceptionable. But this is the very

[3] Most assuredly they had never ceased—the miracles of Joshua were of a most awfully solemn character. The book of Judges has its miracles, and so have the books of Samuel. But perhaps Mr. Newman would consider Joshua in the position answering to that of the Apostles.

point in dispute. The evidence is so unsatisfactory, at best, for the miracles of a later age than the Apostles, or at all events after the first three centuries, that our doubts of their occurrence are increased in a manifold ratio, when we find them to be the vouchers for a new body of doctrine. We are quite willing to admire the vividness and power with which Mr. Newman seizes upon every circumstance, which can present the dealings of God to us in a beautiful and symmetrical form; it seems to be, as it were, a part of his religious nature: but in this instance we think that he has allowed his love of analogy to lead him to an entirely improper use of its teaching. We feel the beauty of Butler's Analogy too warmly, not to be extremely jealous of any thing which may seem to lessen the value of the chief argument on which it rests. And few things can be more prejudicial to its persuasiveness, than to see something like an imitation of it which leads to unsound conclusions. It would, in the present instance, have been available, we willingly admit, to answer presumptions against these miracles, if cogent evidence is offered to prove their occurrence; but the mere circumstance that an ingenious and religiously-disposed mind can think out an analogy for them, and assign a place in God's dispensation to them, is hardly to be used as a presumption in their favour, and stand in the place of evidence. We do not mean that their antecedent probability is placed upon this basis alone; but still we think that in this respect the argument is unfairly used.

Another ground on which the antecedent probability is argued, are the declarations of our Lord in the Gospel of St. Mark, where He enumerates the "signs" which "shall follow them that believe."—St. Mark xvi. 17—19. This is, no doubt, a grave and important consideration, and we ought to be very careful in our interpretation of such a passage; but at the same time it is obvious, that it leaves the question entirely open, as to the time to which the performance of this promise must extend. The fulfilment of the prophecy is recorded in the last verse of the same chapter, which declares that they "went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." We are not here arguing for its restriction to this one fulfilment; but we contend that this declaration of the Evangelist, and the fuller exposition of these signs, as wrought by the Apostles and recorded in the Acts, altogether satisfy the conditions of the promise. We have heard it sometimes remarked, that the gift of miracles was bestowed on the Church, and its withdrawal is no where intimated; and while we admit the assertion, we must limit its cogency. It is valid, as far as it goes, only against peremptory conclusions, that

no other miracles have been, or ever will be, performed in the Church. But the number of those, at least among well-informed or thinking men, who would attempt or wish to establish such a conclusion must be so few, as to be utterly insignificant, so that we cannot think this maxim of quite as much importance as those who quote it appear to deem it.

There is another maxim, for which we do not wish to make Mr. Newman responsible, but which it was our destiny to hear in several quarters, as soon as the discussion of these questions was set on foot by him, and practically illustrated by the Lives of the Saints. It is, that unbelief is a very bad condition for the mind of man, and that belief is so much better for him than unbelief, that we ought rather to accept these stories with tenderness and faith, than critically and sceptically to doubt them. With much respect for the tender feeling which dictated this maxim, we must consider it altogether lacking in wisdom. If we are asked whether it was a better and a happier state of mind for a heathen to attribute his recovery from disease to Esculapius, and make his offering in gratitude for the cure, than to scoff at such a belief, we should acknowledge that there this maxim might have some weight. He had no guide to truth, and if he gave up that faint hope and that feebly supported belief, he had nothing to fall back upon, he had nothing with which he could satisfy the desire of the human heart after some relations with a Power above, which nothing can altogether obliterate. But a Christian has a guide to truth, which commands him to try the spirits, whether they be of God, and he must be careful lest this easiness of belief should lead him to views utterly at variance with the doctrines of that infallible guide. But, surely, we are chargeable with no evil spirit of unbelief, if we acknowledge the mercies of God, and recognize his healing hand, although we discard the intercession of a saint, or doubt the virtue of a relic. These two maxims we should have thought scarcely worthy of animadversion, if we did not happen to know how widely they have spread, and how disproportionate the influence is which they have exercised, to their real validity.

The last observation which we shall now make on the argumentative portion of this essay, is on the reflections with which it concludes[4]. After remarking that the fathers[5] wrote for contemporaries not for us, and that they did not foresee that

[4] That is Section IV; in which the general argument is closed. Section V. is devoted, after a few preliminary observations, to an examination of the evidence for particular alleged miracles.

[5] In using language in regard to miracles which indicated their frequent occurrence; as notorious facts, &c.

evidence would become a science, doubt be thought a merit, and disbelief a privilege, and the author further observes, that,

"They did not feel that man was so self-sufficient, and so happy in his prospects for the future, that he might reasonably sit at home, closing his ears to all reports of Divine interposition, till they were actually brought before his eyes, and faith was superseded by sense; they did not so disparage the Spouse of Christ, as to imagine that she should be accounted, by professing Christians, a school of error, and a workshop of fraud and imposture."—pp. ciii. civ.

The chief conclusion which one seems to gather from the former part of this sentence, is an acknowledgment that the evidence of the Gospel and the truths of Scripture are insufficient for the comfort and happiness of man, unless they are supported by the testimony of these interpositions; a conclusion against which we must protest, until we are assured on evidence, as strong as that for Scripture, that the Almighty has thought it necessary to vouchsafe this supplement to his word. The latter part would carry more weight, if unfortunately history did not intervene to show that the Romish Church, at all events, has given too much countenance to such an accusation. Until we are prepared to admit such claims as the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, annually exhibited to the Neapolitan world, to the title of miracles, or the miraculous movements of the images of Italy, attested at the beginning of this century by cardinals, and every grade of laity and clergy, and sanctioned by the pope, we are unhappily reduced to the necessity of strict examination and consequent rejection. We have, however, a consolation in remembering, that our incredulity here must date from very early times, and may be supported by the best authority. The rule which St. Augustine applied to the miracles of the Donatists, expresses with greater brevity than we have elsewhere seen, the explanation which after all must be given, unless we renounce all claim to any use of our reason in the matter.

"Nemo ergo vobis fabulas vendat. Et Pontius fecit miraculum, et Donatus oravit, et respondet ei Deus de cœlo. Primo, *aut fallunt aut falluntur*."—Aug. Expos. in Evang. Joann. Tract. xiii. de Cap. iii.

This is St. Augustine's first rule; his second is, that no miracle is to be listened to, if claimed by those who break the unity of the Church. But, unhappily, the first rule is but too applicable to the claim of miracles put forth by the Church of Rome, and if it be very widely applied, the responsibility must rest with those who made its application necessary by their frauds and delusions.

We do not profess to have considered all which is brought forward in this essay, but those which we have selected are salient points of the argument. We have endeavoured to place before the reader some of the reflections which have suggested themselves to us, from the time we first read the work, and which we think calculated to diminish the evil likely to be caused by these speculations. That Mr. Newman was actuated only by a desire to preserve that which he believed to be true and holy from an unrighteous judgment, we are quite willing to concede; but that concession cannot blind us to the mischievous consequence of such a treatise. We believe that, instead of raising the evidence for ecclesiastical miracles, its chief effect must be, if admitted, to lower that for Scripture. That this, again, is an effect which its author, gifted as he is with so many qualities calculated to command esteem, would deprecate, we have no doubt. But we have endeavoured to judge calmly and truly concerning this essay, and we can come to no other conclusion.

The remainder of the preliminary matter to Fleury is occupied with an examination of the evidence of some particular miracles, alleged to have occurred before the end of the fourth century. Nine instances are selected, which are as follows:—

1. The Thundering Legion.
2. The change of water into oil by St. Narcissus of Jerusalem.
3. The miracle wrought on the course of the river Lycus by St. Gregory Thaumaturgus.
4. Constantine's Luminous Cross.
5. The discovery of the Holy Cross.
6. The death of Arius.
7. The fiery eruption on Julian's attempt to rebuild the Jewish Temple.
8. The recovery of the blind man by the relics of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius at Milan.
9. The Miracle upon the African Confessors in the Arian persecution, mutilated by Hunneric.

Of these, the first and the last (and perhaps the death of Arius) are of that class in which, although the fact is indisputable, its miraculous nature is questionable, we mean the Thundering Legion and the Confessors, who spoke clearly after the excision of their tongues. The cases of Narcissus and of Gregory repose upon testimony which is rather late; the miracle of Narcissus is reported by Eusebius on tradition. Narcissus having died early in the third century, (about A.D. 212,) and Eusebius having been born A.D. 264; and the miracle of St. Gregory depends on the testimony of St. Gregory of Nyssa, who was not born till more than sixty years after his death, and

although he received information from Macrina, his grandmother, who had been brought up at Neocæsarea by the disciples of St. Gregory, yet this testimony can hardly be considered very satisfactory. The testimony to the Luminous Cross of Constantine is certainly contemporary evidence, but it is surrounded with so many grave difficulties, that we cannot see how it can be placed in comparison with the evidences for Scripture miracles. Our space will not admit of our entering into the question of the discourses of the Holy Cross. It has been discussed at great length by Mr. Newman and Dr. Robinson; the latter of whom has written a great deal to prove that Helena, as other writers had maintained before, fixed upon a wrong site for the holy sepulchre. To those who desire to form a judgment on the subject, we must recommend Dr. Robinson's "*Biblical Researches*," Mr. Newman's discussion in this treatise, and Dr. Robinson's reply in the first number of the "*Bibliotheca Sacra*." We must decline giving any opinion till after a more rigorous examination of both sides of the argument. But with regard to the *miracles* said to be wrought on the discovery of the cross, they rest on very feeble testimony, even as stated by Mr. Newman. There remains, however, one miracle which seems to us one of the best authenticated of all antiquity, and yet even that is liable to no small amount of suspicion. We mean the recovery of the blind man at Milan. There is no doubt that St. Ambrose, Paulinus, and St. Augustine believed that a butcher, named Severus, who had *for some time* been blind, received his sight on touching the relics of St. Gervasius and St. Protasius, that St. Augustine was at Milan at the time, and that this miracle is reported by them[6]. There is, however, when we compare this miracle with those of the Gospel, that wide difference in the strength of the testimony, that even this is left at an immeasurable distance from them in point of evidence. The ready credence which such miracles then received from St. Augustine, who gave to it what Paley justly calls an *otiose* assent, rather precludes any belief that he should have instituted any strict inquiry as to the previous circumstances of the man's illness. Nor does it appear that St. Ambrose thought this requisite. If we compare the case of the blind man in the Gospel restored to sight, we find that he was *blind from birth*, that the case was inquired into by a judicial committee, as it were, composed of our Lord's enemies; and lastly, as another point of difference of great moment, though the court was opposed

[6] We have carefully examined the three passages in which St. Augustine speaks of this occurrence.

to St. Ambrose, yet the great mass of the populace was in his favour; he was at the head, therefore, of a large and powerful party, which ultimately prevailed. We have always considered this miracle to be, perhaps, the one which has, upon the whole, the strongest claim to attention of any which we find recorded in the first four centuries; but, on examination, we cannot fail to see how far the evidence in its favour falls short of that with which it has pleased God, in his mercy, to substantiate the great miracles of revelation.

In regard to Julian's attempt to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, we have before cited the admission of Bishop Douglas that he considers it a Divine interposition, and in this opinion the greater number of modern writers, we believe, coincide. It is obviously impossible in the limited space of one article to examine minutely each of these miracles. Our object has been briefly to point out the difference which really exists between them and the Scripture miracles; a task which, however humble, cannot be considered useless, so long as any attempt can be made to place them on any thing like the same footing.

The principal points brought forward in the discussion by Mr. Newman having now been touched upon, we shall briefly illustrate the rapid development which this doctrine of the trustworthiness of the Ecclesiastical miracles received in the Lives of the Saints, published very shortly after the appearance of this dissertation. Mr. Newman intimates in one part of his Essay, that the same principles on which he defends primitive miracles will defend the mediæval, and accordingly, these biographies are constructed on the broad ground of admitting the legendary stories of miracles to a considerable degree of credit. It is carried in some cases to such a morbid extent, that it is thought necessary gravely to apologize for venturing to look upon the story of St. Helier carrying his own head in his hands as a fable. The legendary belief in certain miracles is accepted as a voucher that other miracles, if not those actually narrated, were really wrought; so that at last we are led to imagine that in history and biography we are not to examine evidence, but, as we are writing or reading for edification, we may take that which appears the most edifying as a subject of meditation. It was happily suggested in a contemporary periodical, that if one desired to give a person unacquainted with German Rationalism and the extravagancies of Strauss, a notion of what they supposed to be the explanation of the wonders of Revelation, by assuming that they are mythical narratives, the transition from *myth* to *history* could hardly be better illustrated than by these volumes. It is here an openly

avowed principle, and defended on the ground that by these means only can we obtain an adequate and faithful representation of these holy men of old.

We have no wish to use any harsh or uncharitable language towards men, whose religious sensibilities have been strongly awakened, although one cannot but condemn the direction which they have taken; but at the same time we see no term which can properly be applied to such compositions, except that of religious romances. It is a very grave question, whether it is at all proper thus to tamper with truth in matters of so great importance; whether the habit of representing things thus fictitiously be not apt to engender a disregard of truth; but we can use no terms too strong for the reprobation we feel for such representations, when their authors would impose them upon us for history. Their intentions may be good, but the means they use are deplorably wrong and mischievous. The natural effect of such compositions must be to lower the love for truth as truth, both in the author and his readers, and to unfit the mind for discrimination between truth and falsehood, and thus to introduce confusion and doubt into those very regions from which they would wish to banish scepticism. This is one of those consequences, somewhat in the way of judgments, which a disregard of truth seems usually to bring. It will not allow its majesty to be insulted with impunity. And with the authors of these Lives it would seem almost that while they are writing these romances, and even while they are conscious of the mythical dress with which they invest their narrative, they impose upon themselves, and actually believe that they are writing very profound and true histories. The introduction to the life of St. German remarkably illustrates this effect.

"Care has been taken in the annexed work, to avoid as far as possible all dogmatism upon disputed points of doctrine and discipline. The austerities of saints and the miracles they performed, are, in some measure, an exception; both because the numbers of those who have ungenial feelings with regard to them are gradually diminishing, and because they form, as it were, the very substance of ancient hierology. At the same time, many things which are out of date in this country, have been produced just as they were found in original documents, for the sake of historical veracity. Facts have been often related as facts, without any intention of proposing them as examples. For which reason little has been said about the development of any principle into its consequences, or the different stages of the process, as necessarily involving an opinion and a decision upon the thing developed, or the reality of the development. *Those miracles which have been given without any stress upon the authority or evidence, are here con-*

sidered true and credible as far as testimony can make any thing credible. Still on the circumstances and accidents chiefly has the weight been laid, inasmuch as probable evidence varies in its influence in proportion to the shades of human disposition and prejudice. Where no authority is given, that of Constantius, the contemporary of St. German, must be supposed; elsewhere the author, or the sources of the information, are distinctly marked. Hericus, the commentator of Constantius, after his original, stands out among the recorders of these miracles."

In the passage which we have placed in italics, the assertion with which it closes is not a little astounding. We confess there is an obscurity about the condition expressed in these words, " which have been given without any stress upon the authority or evidence," which we cannot profess to clear up. But there is no ambiguity about the declaration, that some of these miracles are considered true and credible, *as far as testimony can make any thing credible.* These words are very strong, and if spoken deliberately, we must consider them calculated most awfully to pervert the truth, and to undermine all faith in historical evidence and testimony. If such miracles as are recorded in this volume are "*true and credible*," as far as testimony can make any thing credible, they are placed in this respect on a footing of certainty equal to that on which the Holy Scriptures stand. The doctrine professedly maintained[7] in the Essay on Miracles was, that Ecclesiastical and Scriptural miracles differed in their evidence and character; but the doctrine was not afloat two years before it received a development, by which we find that the evidence for these miracles is as good as testimony can make it. And as we proceed, we shall find that the difference which was once allowed in character, has ceased to be acknowledged. In p. 83, the author speaking of this difference, says—

" Allowing the truth of the remark, still it seems more applicable to the four first centuries of the Church than to the fifth; and again, to public miracles, which affect the Church in general, than to those which rather regard individuals. The miracles of German," he continues, " as will be observed, bear in many cases a strong resemblance to those of our Lord and his Apostles. They are not less striking in the power they evince, the effects they produce, or the publicity with which they were performed."

The first miracle which immediately follows on this deliberate comparison with the miracles of Scripture, is an account of a man with an evil spirit, who had absconded with a bag of money,

[7] We have attempted to show that although this is set forth as one of the conclusions to which the essay tends, the arguments go very much in the contrary direction.

and who was brought before German, who was unable to make him confess his crime. When, however, German proceeded to church to celebrate mass, and had, after the Salutation to the Congregation, fallen prostrate, while he was praying, "the prisoner of Satan, who had been brought to the church, was seen to be raised in the air above the people, and enveloped in a blaze of fire. His cries filled the place, and spread consternation among all. Suddenly with a loud voice he called out the name of German, and made public confession of his theft." The two next narratives are exorcisms of a similar character[8]; the third is an account of a spectre which appeared to the reader of German in a deserted ruin, while German was asleep. The spectre declared that he and a comrade who had been guilty of great crimes were unburied, and deprived of the rest which belonged to other departed spirits. St. German discovers the corpses, buries them, and makes intercession to obtain rest for the departed, and peace for the living; from which time the deserted ruin was no longer disturbed, and became a flourishing and prosperous abode. The last miracle recorded in this chapter (which is, however, only a prelude to the greater miracles of a subsequent date) was wrought upon a cock, who would not crow and awake his master, as he was bound in all duty to do; and German having blessed some wheat and given it to the refractory fowl, unloosed his tongue. This deed, the author tells us, was likely to remain impressed on the minds of the poor, though the rich might have forgotten it; and after reminding us that circumstances which may appear trivial to some are important to others, he ends the chapter with this reflection:—

"Thus could our Lord adapt his wonderful signs to the wants of men, at one time turning water into wine, at another multiplying the loaves, at another taking a fish for the piece of money it contained."

[8] The general remarks which we have made in a former part of this article on exorcisms require a slight addition. We protest, with all the earnestness which such questions demand, altogether against the rationalistic method of explanation, adopted by Farmer, and looked upon, we think, too favourably by Douglas, by which all cases of possession, as recorded in Scripture, are resolved into mere physical and mental diseases. But while we make this earnest protest, we must remark, that we are not prepared to take the converse, and resolve insanity in our own days into demoniacal possession. There are some very interesting remarks on this subject in Mr. Trench's Notes on the Miracles, p. 150—178; in his consideration of the case of the demoniacs among the Gadarenes. He gives many interesting references to Heinroth and other foreign psychologists. But the whole question is one of peculiar difficulty and delicacy, and requires most careful thought. Mr. Trench is always instructive, from his learning and his brilliant thoughts, even when one cannot wholly go along with him.

There are, we are compelled to believe, persons who think this mode of writing proper and edifying; but we should deem it almost an insult to the understanding of our readers, if we thought it necessary to point out at any length the lamentable evils which to our apprehension it exhibits. This desire to give undue honour to the saints brings that which ought to be dearer and more reverenced than the saints into dishonour! We do not see at least what effect can possibly result from such a course, except to expose Scripture to the danger of that irreverence and contempt from which these authors seem so anxious to shield the mediæval saints. It is not, of course, worth while to occupy more space in collecting details of these legendary stories from the different parts already published of this extraordinary series. We have not selected the most offensive, but those to which we have called attention, are sufficient to exhibit the nature of this very rapid development of the principles contained in the essay prefixed to the translation of Fleury, and, we should think, to show the extreme danger and extravagance of such a course to all men of sound mind, who have not resigned themselves to the teaching of such unsafe guides.

But the principle of the Essay is calculated, and its author seems aware of the fact, to defend, not only mediæval miracles, but the miracles of the present day: one of the conclusions to which it tends is, that there was no age after which miracles ceased. The arguments appear to us quite as strong in favour of the miraculous images of Italy as of primitive and mediæval miracles. We know that the answer to this will be, that the presumption in their favour is equal, but that Mr. Newman acknowledges that in all times there have been true miracles and false miracles, and that each case must be examined, and a judgment formed by each individual according to his means of knowledge. But then, again, the positive interdict which is laid upon us against considering the Church a workshop of fraud, &c., appears, on the other hand, to preclude our exercising our judgment on any case supported by the Church of Rome. If this be so, it is well that we should be aware of what that Church has elsewhere dared to countenance, and what we might expect even in our own country and in our own times. It is very difficult to procure a copy of Marchetti's "*Official Memoirs*," to which we have before made allusion, but those who would wish to know the nature of its contents will find in Bishop Philpotts' Supplemental Letter to Charles Butler ample extracts,—at least sufficient to give us warnings of a very portentous kind. The work was found rather unsuitable to the atmosphere of England, however calculated it might be for the

neighbourhood of the Vatican, and it has, we believe, been diligently bought up by Romanists[9].

It seems the most wonderful part of this history, that persons of almost every grade of dignity, lay and ecclesiastical, should have deposed to seeing these images move their eyes, and to the other various wonders which are said to have taken place; but it only serves to render us cautious of mere testimony, when that testimony is derived from persons predisposed to expect and believe these things, and with whom a sort of party rivalry may be said to exist. One is obliged to introduce these considerations, when one observes the effect which the report of such miraculous dealings appears to have upon the offerings to the church in which such images are found. There is a sort of pride, too, in not being outdone by the miracles of a neighbouring Madonna; but if this judgment appears harsh and uncharitable, we must again repeat that *they* are the authors of all the irreverence which may occur, who attempt to support the credit of their Church by such preposterous delusions and such lying devices. If they merely exposed themselves to the contempt of all enlightened Christians it would be a matter of comparatively small moment, but these delusions spread distrust in all evidence among those who are rather better informed among their countrymen, and give an edge to the weapon of the infidel, which it could derive from no other source. But disreputable as these dealings were, it is more discreditable to the Church of Rome that it should have given public sanction to such barefaced impostures and delusions, by the countenance which the Pope himself bestowed upon them.

The Pope instituted a pious fraternity to honour the miraculous image of Ancona, under the name of the Sons and Daughters of Mary[1].

On the 13th of May, 1814, Pius VII. in person *crowned the miraculous image*, and fixed the annual feast of the image for the second Sunday in May, and attached to it the power of

[9] We remember hearing a late eminent poet and philosopher describe a conversation which he held with an Italian of education and rank, who attested some miraculous fact of a most extravagant nature. Mr. —— remonstrated with him, and asked him how he could possibly pretend to have seen such an occurrence. His reply was, if you had been present, and had been in the midst of a crowd of some thousands of persons, every one of whom would be ready to tear you in pieces if you denied it, your sight would have been very much quickened.

[1] The account of this image will be found in the "Pièces Justificatives," of the second volume of De Potter's Life of Scipio de Ricci, extracted from an account of it published by the Abbé Vincent Albertini, in 1820. See Bishop Philpotts' supplemental Letter to C. Butler, from which we quote this instance. The "Official Memoirs" we have formerly seen, but it is very rare, and we are obliged to refer to the same work for all that relates to the miracles it records.

gaining a plenary indulgence; other indulgences had been granted by Pius VI.

Pius VI. instituted the judicial proceedings recorded in the "Official Memoirs," and sanctioned them in various ways, but particularly by the grant of *an annual mass with an office*, for all the clergy of Rome on the 9th of July.

These miracles were not confined to opening and shutting the eyes, sometimes a shower of tears was shed by the images, sometimes a preternatural perspiration bedewed them, &c.; and these monstrous delusions were cherished and sanctioned by the authorities of the Church of Rome, and by the Pope himself[2].

The Lives of the Saints, published in Italy, are often full of the most preposterous miracles, calculated to exalt the patron saint above his compeers, but at present in England we are comparatively free from such impostures. Still in Ireland, the "Life of St. Patrick," by Jocelin of Farnes, who lived in the twelfth century, has been thought sufficiently edifying to be translated for popular reading, not forty years ago: it was translated by Edmund L. Swift, Esq., and published at Dublin in 1809. Those who know the original, will wonder that this should have been ventured upon, so extravagantly ridiculous are the miracles it records, and so utterly mythical is the whole narrative. The original is, of course, curious for those who desire to investigate the habits of thinking of the century in which it was composed, but if intended for religious edification, it seems calculated only for persons sunk in the most grovelling superstition and ignorance. Scarcely a page occurs without a miracle, in comparison of which the miracles of Scripture are almost insignificant; mountains are swallowed up in the earth and raised again; lakes removed; cheeses converted into stones; numbers are raised from the dead; a veil is sent from heaven; boys torn in pieces are restored to life; fourteen thousand men refreshed with the meat of five animals, &c. &c. These are only a *few* that strike one in merely turning over the leaves and reading the titles of the chapters, but there is one which has always seemed to us of a most peculiar character. A thief, who had stolen and devoured a tame goat belonging to St. Patrick, denied the theft, on which the goat from the stomach of the man bleated loudly forth and

[2] In justice to Pius VII., we must add that he disclaimed some miracles attributed to him. He told a lady of our acquaintance that she would see engravings representing a miraculous occurrence, in which he was lifted up during the mass preternaturally. He denied the fact altogether, and disapproved of the publication. Some of the tears of the images were tears of blood, but the trick by which they were produced was discovered.

proclaimed the merit of St. Patrick; and all the posterity of the thief were afflicted with the beard of a goat!

There may be persons, as we have before intimated, who think that these legends are edifying as religious reading, and consider it profane and irreverent to discard them at once; but we can see nothing but a perversion of the light of the religious conscience within us, which can ever induce us to look upon such legends as any thing but monstrous, fabulous, and utterly abominable.

But it will be said the authorship belongs to the twelfth century, and this is true; but the translation belongs to our own century; and although the translator does not require us to assent to the miracles, yet he considers the book as conducive to piety and virtue. He will not allow the author to be accused of falsehood or imposture, that the narratives were probably founded on truth; and although "Pyrrhonism may deride the legendary page of old Jocelin," he warns us, before we "gratulate our own superior wisdom, to consider whether implicit belief be not at least as safe as absolute scepticism." The bearing of this sort of argument upon the question, will easily be seen when compared with the representations we have given above of the still more modern notions on ecclesiastical miracles.

But leaving these Italian wonders and Irish translations, we are not without indications even nearer home and nearer to the present day, of that which the Romish Church will venture to attempt. The last book[3] in the list of publications at the head of this article, records an attempt in Leicestershire about ten years ago to support the claims of the Church of Rome, by an appeal to a miraculous cure by Mr. Woolfrey, who calls himself parish priest of Grace-Dieu[4] and Whitwick. We here give an account of the miracle in the words of the Rev. Francis Merewether, the incumbent of Whitwick, who deserves our praise for the active part he took in exposing these proceedings. The substantial truth of this account cannot be impeached, although Mr. Woolfrey has attempted to deny three minute points in the statement. But the imputed mis-statements are fully defended in the pamphlet entitled, "Special Pleadings," &c.

"On Sunday, the 6th of December last, a woman of the name of Fullard, living at Whitwick, went to the Romish chapel at Mr. Ambrose Phillipps's of Grace-Dieu; having been for a long time previous afflicted, at intervals, with fits, partaking of the nature of epilepsy. One of them came on while she was at Grace-Dieu on the above day, about a quarter of an hour before the service was ended. A

[3] Special Pleadings, &c.
[4] Grace-Dieu is the residence of Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, Esq.

number having been collected round her near the door of the entrance hall, where she was carried for air, a woman desired the people to move away: for that she was better, and wanted nothing but air. Restoratives were used, and her feet plunged in hot water: after which a medal that had been blessed by the Archbishop of Paris was applied by the priest to the woman's left breast. She almost immediately recovered from the fit, and being taken into the kitchen, and asked to feel in her breast if she had any thing there, she found the medal: and a string was then attached to it, by which it was suspended round her neck, with an injunction that she should wear it. The woman is in possession of the medal, and shows it. She thinks herself cured by it, and believes she shall have no more fits as long as she wears it, and trusts in God: she considers she should be lost without it; and would give it to no one but him who gave it her, the priest[5]."

Mr. Woolfrey, who states that these medals "have wrought innumerable miracles in France, in England, and in other countries" (p. 5), makes reference to the brazen serpent of Moses, and to the clay which our Lord moistened with his spittle, and applied to the eyes of the blind man, in an extremely coarse and offensive style; and then triumphantly asks whether God, who could, and did, confer on a bit of MUD the miraculous efficacy of giving sight to a man born blind, cannot also give to a bit of BRASS, called a MEDAL, "the life miraculous power?" &c.

It is difficult to imagine to whom such language and such arguments can be addressed, but one is happy to learn that the effect has been by no means favourable or encouraging to such attempts. It is desirable, though it can hardly be necessary, to point out the very slender grounds for attributing any thing miraculous to the medal in question, which even the advocates of the miracle bring forward. The woman had been under the fit for some time, she had been for some time under the influence of restoratives, and she was, as far as one can judge, very likely to begin to recover before the medal was applied[6]. Add to this,

[5] Mr. Woolfrey, in an address to the inhabitants of Whitchurch, says, "that there are in Mr. Merewether's address, at least *three facts stated that are perfectly untrue*, viz., saying that the medal was placed on the "left" or right "breast;" and saying that the "woman considers that she should be lost without this medal;" and likewise by saying that a certain woman on the spot "desired the people to move away, for that she was better and wanted nothing but air." Mr. Woolfrey says himself, "I placed it (the medal) on the poor woman's bosom," p. 5. In the last instance Mr. Woolfrey misquotes Mr. M.'s words. He says *a woman*, not *a certain woman*. His authority for the assertion was the woman who held Anne Fullard's head at the time; his authority for the second assertion was Anne Fullard herself who used these very words to himself.

[6] Mr. Woolfrey, however, says, "that she was uninfluenced by the restoratives, and the contortions and blackness in the face continued till they applied the medal, when they instantly left her. In less than a minute she could speak; and in less than five minutes she was up, and walked to the kitchen perfectly cured."—Mr. Woolfrey's Address, p. 5.

the nature of the sermon, on miraculous agency, which she had just heard, and put to the account the strong effect which the mind exerts upon the body in many cases of this kind, and we shall not find that this occurrence has any thing about it which can excite any astonishment, except the very great audacity of the parties who presume to set it forth to the world as a miracle. And this, we say, allowing the whole account to be true without any deductions; but if the statements in the pamphlet, entitled Special Pleadings, may be relied on, which we may presume from the respectability of the author [7], and from the circumstance that they have been before the world ten years, and as far as we can learn by inquiry from persons in the neighbourhood, entirely uncontradicted; if, we say, these statements are facts, they are very significant, and heavy deductions must be made even from the value of the cure. It is stated that the woman was sent home, on account of weakness, in Mr. A. L. Phillipps's carriage, and that a medical man was sent to her the next day, the explanation of which is supposed to be, that this weakness continued, and it is also stated that these fits have since returned.

With these observations we leave the case of Anne Fullard, and if we appear to fall under the same censure with which Mr. Newman has visited Bishop Douglas for his *Criterion*, we must submit to the imputation. But we must remind those who uphold such miracles once more of the mischief they do to the cause of truth, by palming on the world alleged miracles which will not bear examination. But let it not be said that this incredulity is only a Protestant feeling, and let not Douglas bear the whole weight of the indignation which falls on those who doubt of the miracles at the tomb of the Abbé Paris. He might have learned his lesson of incredulity in a school to which perhaps greater attention will now be paid. He followed in this only the leading of the Jesuists in France, and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Sens [8], who is more severe than the Protestant in his reprobation of these alleged miracles.

Our observations have extended to so great length, that we have no space for many other curious illustrations of the subject, which we had prepared; and we must hasten to a conclusion. We have endeavoured to show that the question has been very unfairly and very injudiciously treated by Mr. Newman, but we

[7] We are not at liberty to mention the name of the author. We thought it might have been written by Mr. Merewether, but on further inquiry we found that we were mistaken.

[8] The same side was also maintained by other Roman Catholics. We have consulted in particular two 4to volumes, entitled "*Lettres Theologiques*," to the defenders of these miracles, written, we believe, by La Taste. It was altogether a *party* question in the Roman Catholic Church.

trust that we have been betrayed into no expressions which can be misconstrued into any personal reflections on him. Our business is entirely with his arguments and their tendency, and if his name had been of less weight, we should not have thought them worthy of so much attention. He writes with the desire of upholding what he reverences, and so do we. His sincerity in propounding these views must not recommend them to us, if we think them pernicious, and if we think them calculated to give a handle to the infidel, by lowering the evidence for Scripture, and confusing the boundaries of truth. We trust that our sincerity in the opposite view, which we maintain, and our deep conviction of the necessity of maintaining it, may at all events plead our excuse, if we have spoken in some places in language of considerable strength. We feel that in examining these arguments, nothing but the greatest calmness, in the end, will tell; but when we have to deal with such matters as the images of Italy, and the medals of Paris, we think that any ambiguity, any faltering, would be treason to the sacred cause of Christ.

We shall now conclude with offering a few observations on another passage in Mr. Newman's Essay.

"It shall here be assumed that this incredulity is a fault; and it is the result of a state of mind which has been prevalent among us for some generations, and from which we are now but slowly extricating ourselves. We have been accustomed to believe that Christianity is little more than a creed or doctrine, introduced into the world once for all, and then left to itself, after the manner of human institutions, and under the same ordinary governance with them, stored indeed with hopes and fears for the future, and containing certain general promises of aid for this life, but unattended by any special Divine presence, or any immediately supernatural gift. To minds habituated to such a view of revealed religion, the miracles of Ecclesiastical history must needs be a shock, and almost an outrage, disturbing their feelings, and unsettling their most elementary notions and thoroughly-received opinions. They are eager to find defects in the evidence, or appearances of fraud in the witnesses, as a relief to their perplexity, and as an excuse for rejecting, as if on the score of reason, what their heart and imagination have rejected already. Or they are too firmly persuaded of the absurdity, as they consider it, which such pretensions on the part of the Church involve, to be moved by them at all; and they content themselves with coldly claiming to know points which cannot now be known, or to be satisfied about difficulties which never will be cleared up, before they are asked to take interest in statements which they consider so unreasonable. And certainly they are both philosophical and religious in thus acting, granting that the Lord of all is present with Christians only in the way of nature, as with His creatures all over the earth. On the other hand, if we believe that

Christians are under an extraordinary dispensation, such as Judaism was, and that the Church is a supernatural ordinance, we shall in mere consistency be disposed to treat even the report of miraculous occurrences with seriousness, from our faith in a present Power adequate to their production. Nay, if we go so far as once to realize what Christianity is, considered merely as a creed, and what stupendous overpowering facts are involved in the doctrine of a Divine Incarnation, we shall feel that no miracle can be great after it, nothing strange or marvellous, nothing beyond expectation."—pp. lxxxii. lxxxiii.

It is scarcely necessary to indicate the remarkable omission which this passage exhibits. There is an acknowledgment of the world of miracles and the world of nature, but we hear nothing of that middle world, the world of grace, to which believers in a Christian land like ours are accustomed to look. The world of grace has, indeed, its miracles! The heart subdued and changed, and the spirit purified, and the whole nature regenerated! And does Mr. Newman think that Christians can believe in these and all the wonderful works of God in His spiritual kingdom, and yet think that they are wrought without a special presence of that heavenly Redeemer in the heart of man, without His indwelling power and His undoubted and special operation! We do but suggest this thought, and a thousand illustrations of it will rise up spontaneously in the heart of every thoughtful Christian! We can find them in every daily walk, and we acknowledge them as miracles of unseen agency. We never see those whom poverty and age have bowed down to the earth, looking forward with peaceful hope, and careful only for the everlasting interests of their soul, and not acknowledge that it is a miracle wrought by the special hand of Him who alone can raise us up from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, and we need no other token of His presence with His Church than these—the miracles of grace [1]. And let us not then fear the imputation of incredulity, or care that we are accused of not acknowledging the presence of our Lord among us, when we find daily such wonders as these in the cottage or in the sick chamber, because we refuse to listen to lying miracles, and dare to examine delusions and impostures.

There is only one consideration besides, which we would suggest to the thoughtful inquirer. It is this—it seems to us that throughout the Bible there is a *gradual withdrawal* of the *visible* presence of God, and the *open* marks of His government. And it suggests itself to our mind to inquire whether this be not preparatory, and perhaps a necessary preparation, for a spiritual dis-

[1] We must remark also, that the line between the answer to prayer in regard to healing diseases, and miraculous cures, is one which we must not attempt too strictly to define.

pensation, where the trial of our faith is one of the main branches of our probation.

God walked and spoke with Adam in the garden of Eden, God openly governed the Israelites by the hand of Moses and Joshua, showing great and national miracles, but soon there was "no open vision," and miracles and prophecy appear almost to have ceased for some centuries before our Lord's appearance on the earth. We disapprove of *predicting* the course of God's providential dealings by analogy, but we think that if visible interpositions were then altogether suspended after the Apostolic age, or at the latest at the civil establishment of Christianity, a thoughtful observer might see in this only the conclusion of a scheme already partially developed; and the continuation of a system already commenced of gradual withdrawal. We do not presume to set this forth dogmatically, but we suggest it as an analogical argument. But the two main points on which we would insist are these, that if miracles of later ages have any mission or any message to us from God, it is those only which are endued with trustworthy evidence, and that the miracles of God's invisible agency in His kingdom of grace are tokens of His presence in His Church, which cannot be mistaken; and which still leave room for that trial of our faith which is most strictly consonant to a spiritual dispensation.

ART. VI.—1. *A Defence of the Queen's Supremacy against Romish Aggressions; in Two Letters to a Friend in France. By* CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, *D.D., Canon of St. Peter's, Westminster.* London: F. & J. Rivington.

2. *A Report of Speeches delivered at a Meeting of the Members and Friends of the National Club held at Willis's Rooms, on Saturday, May* 2, 1846. London: Printed by Alexander Mackintosh, Great New-street. 1846.

AMIDST the brilliant discoveries in politics and religion, which are crowding upon us each day more and more thickly; and amidst the striking examples continually presented to us, of an enlargement of intellect, which disdains and explodes all theories and principles which bear the stamp of antiquity: in such days of illumination, and of progress, we are positively startled at a voice which, in the full effulgence of the nineteenth century, arises, as it were, from some abode of things forgotten and dead, and speaks of the "Queen's supremacy," and of "Romish aggression," as men spoke and thought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries! There is something quite ghostly in the sound of such things; so wholly antiquated are the principles on which this Church and nation used for ages to act—nay, indeed, on which they continued to act till within the recollection of the present generation of men. There was a time when the Sovereigns of England looked on the royal supremacy in ecclesiastical affairs as the brightest jewel in their diadem; and when English statesmen guarded that precious possession with even an excessive care, looking in wrath on all who, whether within this realm or without, sought to despoil the English Crown of its ecclesiastical supremacy. There was a time when imprisonment, confiscation, and even death, were the penalties of such attempts. There was a time when kings and ministers, nobles and knights, bishops and divines, were alike occupied in defending by pen, and sword, and judicial process, and spiritual censures—by fining and confining, deprivation, excommunication, degradation, beheading, hanging, drawing, and quartering, and more other penalties and arguments than we can remember, the royal supremacy over all estates and degrees of men, "in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, within this realm." Now, we are by no means saying that we consider all the modes and methods which our governors in

Church and State in those times took to enforce the doctrine of the royal supremacy, as the best and most judicious that could possibly have been adopted. We disclaim any such theory of Optimism. Henry VIII. and Edward, Elizabeth, and James, and Charles, Cranmer and Cromwell, Jewell and Burleigh, Hooker and Bacon, Laud and Clarendon, may, or may not have been ignorant bigots and persecutors. We do not here pretend to discuss this knotty question, or to justify the course of legislative and executive interference on behalf of the supremacy of the Crown which they concurred in or defended. But, whether they were right or wrong, one thing is evident, that they acted under most serious convictions of the importance and reality of the question under debate. Men do not inflict or suffer death for a mere abstract theory of no practical importance.

Times have certainly changed. In the seventeenth century, the publication of defences of the royal supremacy against Romish aggressions, converted many a poor curate into a rich prebendary or a dean, and many a prebendary into a lordly prelate; but we apprehend that at present, if there were not certain legal impediments in the way, the defence of the supremacy would be more likely to transmute bishops and prebendaries back again into unbeneficed divines. We allude, of course, to such defences as include any resistance to "*Romish aggressions*," which, in the present day, are courted by the advocates of liberal principles, and which the statesmen of England have been for many years past eager to gratify by corresponding concessions. "Aggressions" forsooth! Why, of course, Romanism is making "aggressions," and it has quite as much right to do so as Chartism or the Anti-Corn-law League. "Every one for himself," is the principle of our political economy; and the pope cannot be blamed for acting on so enlightened a doctrine. The principle of free trade, which removes all prohibitions from the introduction of foreign productions, and leaves us at liberty to deal in whatever markets we please, aims at breaking down all the jealousies and restraints which have kept nations aloof from each other. The generous rivalry of nations is henceforward to consist, not in the maintenance of national dignity and morality, but in the accumulation of wealth, and the most advantageous interchange of productions. Each class in the community is to obtain as much as it possibly can at the expense of the remainder; and under these circumstances, it seems only consistent to withdraw any prohibitions which may exist to the importation of the papacy, more especially if it comes recommended by any principles of political economy. The simple question at present seems to be, would

the introduction of the papal supremacy operate beneficially on our manufactures? Prove that it would do so, and the point is carried.

"Tempora mutantur:" the principles of the eighteenth century seem to have almost died out with the century in which they flourished. And yet we must confess, that while such men as Dr. Wordsworth continue to advocate the old principles of the constitution in Church and State, the ideas of the nineteenth century are not likely to have *absolute* and *undisputed* sway.

Dr. Wordsworth is a writer who is quite capable of reviving an extinct principle and cause, and of lending fresh energy and power to one which is feeble and expiring. His extensive and accurate research; his purity and integrity of principle; and the strong faith which he possesses in the truth and the certainty of the doctrines which he inculcates; combined with a generous and ardent devotion to his cause, irrespective of all selfish considerations; invest his advocacy with more than ordinary animation and interest, and cannot fail to gain the respect even of those who may differ from the principles which he advocates.

On a former occasion, we were led to offer some remarks on Dr. Wordsworth's able and well-timed pamphlets on the Maynooth Bill—publications, the value of which at the particular crisis which elicited them cannot be too highly estimated, and which most decidedly furnished to the opponents of that ill-advised measure in both Houses of Parliament the greater part of their arguments against it. The introduction of the Bill for the removal of penalties for religious opinions, by the Lord Chancellor, appears to have led to the publication of the "Letters" now before us, the object of which is to specify the objections which may be offered to that measure. In the first of these letters Dr. Wordsworth, after distinguishing between the temporal and the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign, proceeds to prove that the papal claims interfere with the *former*—that the Canon Law and the oaths of bishops to the Roman pontiff assert his temporal power over sovereigns; that in a recent edition of the Roman Canon Law it is asserted, that the kingly power is subject to the pontifical, that the pope may depose sovereigns, and absolve subjects from their allegiance; that all oaths to the prejudice of the Church of Rome are null and void; and that Romish ecclesiastics may resist their sovereigns for the good of their Church. He next turns to history, and touches on the deposition of sovereigns by the popes in various ages; not forgetting the cases of our Henry VIII. and Elizabeth. A more recent instance of the exercise of this temporal power is pointed out in the Bull of Pius VII., directing the bishops and clergy of

France to take the oath of allegiance to the French Republic, and recognising in the first consul the rights of the ancient dynasty. The deposition of one hundred Gallican bishops from their sees "to which they had been appointed by the King of France," and the coronation of Napoleon, are pointed out as further instances of the exercise of the same power by the pope. The Services of Gregory VII. and Pius V. in the Roman Breviary, the Bull *in Cœna Domini*, the oath taken by Roman Catholic bishops at their consecration, are further appealed to in proof that the Roman pontiffs have always claimed temporal dominion over the subjects of other princes, and that those claims have never been retracted.

We do not think it necessary here to enter into an examination of all the particular proofs which Dr. Wordsworth has advanced in support of his position. Perhaps we may not feel quite certain that all the facts which he states will bear the weight of inference which is placed on them. But there can be no doubt that the position which is contended for, is fully and decisively established; and after so clear and able an exposition of the fact, the civil power certainly cannot act in ignorance of the *claims* of the see of Rome: if it be disposed to compromise its temporal rights in favour of that see, "the blame," as Dr. Wordsworth pithily remarks, "lies with itself, and it must take the consequences—si vult decipi, *decipiatur*."

Whether the State "vult decipi" in such a matter as this, seems to us somewhat problematical. That it is very unwilling to have any opposition made to the amplest concession of the claims of the Romanists is undoubted. But the State does not suppose, we apprehend, that such acts of concession will compromise its own powers, or confer any temporal authority on the see of Rome. We conceive that statesmen are in general perfectly indifferent to the admitted *claims* of the see of Rome to depose princes, and exempt subjects from their oaths of obedience. They imagine, and certainly not without reason, that the popes know too well the extent of their power to venture on such acts in the nineteenth century—that such acts would probably only demonstrate the fallen condition of the Roman power, and would recoil in disgrace and danger on the heads of those who made the attempt. They probably are inclined to look on these temporal claims, which are not able to put themselves in execution, in much the same light as Henry IV. or Louis XIV. regarded the assumption of the royal arms and the title of king of France by the contemporary English sovereigns. And looking merely at the world as it is—looking at the fact that the papal power is wholly dependent on Austria and France for its political exist-

ence—that the temporal power has in many of the Roman Catholic states not merely preserved its own supremacy in temporals, notwithstanding the claims of the Roman see, but has usurped extensive power in spirituals, either with or without the concurrence of the popes; looking at such facts as these, it does seem at first sight, that the mere fact of the claims of the Roman pontiffs to temporal power over other sovereigns, need not inspire statesmen with any serious apprehensions in making such concessions to Romanists in these countries as they may on other grounds deem advisable. Arguing from probabilities, it does not seem likely that the throne of Queen Victoria, or her successors, will ever be directly endangered by papal bulls of deposition or excommunication. The danger before us is of a very different sort. Whether the throne will survive it, is indeed a serious question; but if it does not, we feel assured that something different from papal bulls and decrees will have caused it.

But while the present state of the world, as regarded by statesmen, may relieve them from the apprehensions which were most justly felt in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, in reference to the claims of the papacy to temporal power, it is very possible that their contempt for these claims may be carried too far. They may find, that although the see of Rome is not likely in the nineteenth century to depose sovereigns, it may have the power of recognizing *new sovereigns or states* in a way which would be highly injurious to the interests of England, and might serve to exercise a fatal influence on the integrity of the empire. They may find, if all prohibitions on the introduction of papal bulls and mandates are removed,—if those decrees are permitted openly and with the full sanction of the law to circulate, which have hitherto been brought in by stealth and connivance,—that regulations may be introduced which will operate in various ways in temporal matters. The temporalities of the Roman Catholic Communion, at least, may be at any time the subject of papal regulation and interference, and those temporalities are every day becoming of more importance. It may not be possible to specify the particulars in which the power of the Roman see, if once recognized, and given a *locus standi* by the English government, may be found embarrassing and inconvenient. The papal power is always an encroaching one, whenever there is the slightest chance of success. In the liberty of our civil constitution, which affords unbounded scope to parties to urge their claims, there is a facility for the increase of the papal power, of which it will be certain to avail itself. Assiduity, perseverance, obstinacy, will prevail in the long run over weak governments. The same process which we have seen successfully employed by various political parties in this

country for the accomplishment of their objects, will infallibly be employed by the Roman see and its numerous advocates and adherents, if the opportunity is afforded. Doubtless the see of Rome does not directly depose sovereigns and absolve from oaths of allegiance in the nineteenth century; but it does interfere in mixed causes which the State is very greatly interested in, and it interferes so as to embarrass and prevail against the State. Take the case of mixed marriages in Germany. How much uneasiness, and inconvenience, and even danger arose to the Prussian government in the well-known case of the Archbishop of Cologne; and the result of the whole was, that the state was obliged to succumb to the papal power. Again, the French government has been recently obliged to call in the aid of the pope in order to suppress the order of Jesuits. Every step of this kind strengthens the influence of the papacy, and encourages it to further interference. In any contests with a government constituted as that of England must always be, the papacy would be almost certain of meeting sympathy and support from various classes of persons in the community. It is far too wary ever to attempt contests with temporal governments on questions which do not in some degree affect religion or "religious liberty," and in all such questions it would be sure to meet with so much sympathy in the English mind, that no government could effectually, in the long run, prevent it from attaining its object. There could not well be a more short-sighted policy than that which would recognize the papal power as an element in our social condition, and which would with conciliatory views give it a legal existence amongst us. Weak and contemptible as the papacy may seem to English statesmen, and weak as it is in some respects, still it does not follow that it might not very seriously embarrass at times the government of this country, or that it could by possibility be restricted by the State to subjects and questions which are simply spiritual and religious. The moment that England attempts to govern Romanists through the see of Rome, it will find its difficulties thicken upon it; for the papacy is not a power which confers favours without expecting an equivalent.

We have offered these remarks on the temporal power of the papacy, because it seems to us that there is a most mistaken way of treating this subject prevalent amongst public men in the present day. They generally imagine, because the claims of a Hildebrand, or an Innocent III., or a Pius V. cannot be enforced, or even put forth at present—because these claims are in the eyes of the world merely ridiculous—that the papacy has no means of acquiring temporal power in other states—that it cannot possibly be dangerous in any way to temporal governments. This

may be generous, and liberal and high-minded. It may argue something of a confiding and romantic spirit. Or on the other hand, it may look like confidence in our own ingenuity and craft, in our own policy and arts of persuasion. We think, perhaps, that the pope is an old gentleman, who may be coaxed and cajoled by neat little attentions and civil speeches into conceding us the power of ruling our own people. But with every conceivable respect and deference for the magnates of the nineteenth century, who are so wondrous wise on the subject of the papal supremacy, and who look in such unutterable scorn on those who entertain any apprehensions of its interference in temporal affairs, we would venture to hint, that the papacy is not altogether blind to its own interests, or devoid of a wish to promote them.

We have digressed somewhat widely from Dr. Wordsworth's publication, and must now return to it. The second of his letters enters on the subject of the "Spiritual Supremacy" of the English Crown, which is thus described and limited by the author:—

"We believe then, that Sovereign governing powers are vicegerents and ministers of Almighty God. For so we are taught by Him in holy writ. We know from the same sacred source, that it is our duty to submit to civil authorities, to pay them tribute, to pray for them, 'that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God.' If, indeed, they should so far forget their duty as to command us to do any thing plainly contrary to the word of God; if they should order us to commit idolatry, or not to pray to God, or not to observe His ordinances, rather than be guilty of these sins, we should prefer the furnace with the three children of Babylon. . . . We obey Cæsar for God's sake, but we cannot disobey God for Cæsar's; but in all his lawful, and not unlawful commands, we obey Cæsar as God."

. . . "Sovereigns are God's 'ministers to us for good,' not only of our bodies, but our souls; and it would be very degrading to them, and very irreverent to Him, whose ministers they are, to suppose that their care is to be limited to the *temporal* wants of their subjects. No; here is the true dignity, the glorious prerogative of the kingly office; it extends to the soul. . . . Since the Almighty Himself gives to kings and queens the title of 'nursing fathers and nursing mothers' of His Church, and since it is the *chief* duty of fathers and mothers in their families to provide for the *spiritual* welfare of their offspring, it cannot be supposed that the eternal interests of their subjects are not to be the *first* care of sovereigns. This being so, it follows that they have a divine *right* to those powers, without which this duty cannot be performed. They have, that is to say, royal authority in spiritual matters, as well as in temporal. Let us proceed to examine in what this authority consists."—pp. 28—30.

It "does not extend to the performance of any sacred func-

tion,—such as the ministration of the word or sacraments," or ordination; it consists in seeing "that all they who have sacred functions assigned to them perform them duly." The sovereign has not "any priestly power," but he may "command all those who have that power to *use it rightly*."—p. 31. The English Crown has "the right of placing persons, whose spiritual qualifications have been ascertained and approved by the spiritual authorities, in the sees which the Crown itself has founded, and in allowing them to *exercise* episcopal jurisdiction over its subjects within the limits duly assigned to them." It has also the right to summon councils and ratify their decrees.—p. 33. 35. But this supremacy is only acknowledged to exist

"According to the ancient principles and practices of the Christian Church, and *for the maintenance* of her laws: but observe, *against these received laws and customs of the Church*, no power is claimed by our princes, nor is any ascribed to them by us. 'Nihil potest rex, nisi quod *jure* potest.' Our most gracious Queen has *supreme* power according to the laws, and *for* the laws, but *against* them *none*."—p. 35.

This is a manly and firm exposition of the principle of ecclesiastical liberty, which is absolutely essential to the preservation of the Church. The supremacy without such a limitation would be liable to all the objections which are so frequently and so unreasonably urged against it by sectarians. But admit this principle, so clearly and forcibly laid down by Dr. Wordsworth, and the regal supremacy is at once divested of all power of entrenching on the great rights and prerogatives of the Church. The sovereign power is bound to rule according to "the laws and customs of the Church:" its acts are not binding where they are opposed to the laws of God, or the laws of the Church: its power becomes null in any such case. And who is to judge of the agreement or disagreement between the laws of the Church and the injunctions of the Sovereign? Certainly the Church herself: for to place this power in the hand of the sovereign, would be to invest him with *absolute* power, which the Church does not admit to be his attribute. We take it that this affords the true solution of the difficulties growing out of the suppression of half the episcopal sees in Ireland in 1833. It is obvious, notwithstanding all that has been said in justification of that measure, that it was a transgression of the laws and customs of the Church. Here was a case in which nearly half of the episcopal body of a national Church was swept away without any consent from the Church itself—nay, in opposition to the solemn protest of the great majority of its prelates,

including three metropolitans out of four. It was a measure which was obviously calculated to be most injurious to a Church which was surrounded by a vast multitude of opponents, and which demanded for its preservation the most unremitting assiduity of its actual hierarchy—which even required an increase in their numbers, and more earnest exertions in every direction. It was calculated to afford a new argument against the Church herself, as if she was the mere creature and slave of the Parliament, and it was an infringement on the canons of the Church to suppress bishoprics without consent of the proper ecclesiastical authorities. The inference from these facts is supplied by Dr. Wordsworth: the acts of the temporal power suppressing the sees in Ireland were *null;* they were of no binding force, because they were contradictory to the laws and customs of the Church; and the Sovereign has "supreme power according to the laws, and for the laws, but against them none."

Here, then, was a case in which the Church was not bound by the acts of the temporal power—a case in which the Church might, without any violation of her own principles of obedience to the State, have refused steadily to acquiesce in such laws, and waited until the temporal power had retraced its steps. It was a case in which the heads of the Church of Ireland might have refused to perform any consecrations or any ecclesiastical acts whatever, that could recognize such a departure from the duties of the temporal power. But the Church judged otherwise: and as it acquiesced in the measure, it has gradually passed into a custom; and the Church in acting on and recognizing this custom, gives to it all the necessary sanctions. There is a broad distinction between this case and the union of the sees of Bristol and Gloucester (we *hope* we need not add Bangor and St. Asaph), in 1835. This latter measure was recommended to the temporal powers by the ecclesiastical commission, which included five bishops, amongst whom were the two metropolitans. Such a body, more especially when no opposition was made by the other prelates and clergy, was a species of representation of the Church; and the measure itself did not diminish on the whole the amount of episcopal superintendence in the Church: it merely translated sees to more populous districts: it could not be injurious to the general interests of the Church at large. In all these respects it differed widely from the suppression of the sees in Ireland. But suppose the temporal power to extinguish the church-rates in England, and then to suppress twelve bishoprics in order to provide funds for the repairs of churches; is it not evident that the Church would be entitled, *consistently with the fullest admission of the regal supremacy*, to protest against any such act, and to refuse to recognize it in any

way? If any one is prepared to go to such a length as to maintain that the Church would be bound to acquiesce in such a proceeding, he must be prepared to carry his principle still further, and to affirm, that if *any number* of sees were suppressed by the temporal power the Church ought to submit—so that if the temporal power should reduce the episcopate of England to a single individual, or consolidate the whole country into one diocese and subject it to a foreign bishop, the Church would still be bound to acquiesce. If any one upholds these principles, he ought by analogy to hold, that if the parishes of England were reduced to a tenth or a hundredth of their present number by the State, and the tithes of the remainder were applied to purposes of general education, to the support of dissenting ministers, or to the payment of the poor-rates, the Church ought to acquiesce in the arrangement.

We are merely illustrating the general principle which Dr. Wordsworth has so clearly and satisfactorily laid down—that the Crown has a supremacy in spirituals—a supremacy which is by *Divine* right—a supremacy which fully authorizes the sovereign to take cognizance of ecclesiastical affairs, to make laws on ecclesiastical subjects, to oblige the ministers of religion to execute their duties, and to reform abuses. But a supremacy, also, which is *limited by the laws of God, and the laws and customs of the Church;* which is bound to *maintain* these laws, and *not to violate* them. The same principle is applied in the case of the temporal supremacy to temporal matters; and the final judgment is in either case reserved to the whole body of the Church, or of the nation, respectively.

It is of the greatest importance, under our present circumstances, to endeavour to acquire distinct views on this subject. We shall, probably, be very soon called to act upon them in some way. The Church is in most imminent peril. It is all but certain that one of the first measures of any liberal administration which may assume the reins of power will be—not absolutely the "*destruction*" of the Irish Church; for Lord John Russell has disclaimed any such intention; but such a measure of "*reform*" as will consist in what Mr. O'Connell has described as "bowling down bishops like nine-pins," and sweeping away parishes by hundreds. Here, then, is one question on which the Church ought to be prepared to take a course of firm, united, unswerving opposition, from first to last. She ought to be prepared to remind the Crown of its duties to religion. She ought to go before the Sovereign by her united representatives, and announce the principles—the high, unchangeable, and Christian principles on which she is prepared to act. Her Heads should not

shrink from the duty of firmly and publicly reminding the State of the duties which it owes to God and to God's Church. They should place confidence in the support of the clergy and the people. They should solemnly appeal from the unrighteous acts of the State against the cause of religion, to that God whose ministers they are; and they should be prepared to offer a resolute and persevering opposition to the execution of what they object to on principle. Let them not commit themselves to any ecclesiastical acts which in any way recognize what they condemn. Let them do this at all personal hazards; and they will find that no English government will be able to overcome such an opposition. The State will then respect the Church, and the Church will rise out of the contest with more union and more power than it ever possessed. We would only remind our readers, that the English Church and its hierarchy never were so popular as when the seven bishops, at personal hazard, refused to obey the mandate of James II. We would remind them of the struggle between the Church and the ministry on the question of church-rates in England. On that occasion the heads of the Church denounced the ministerial measure, and their appeal was heard with gratitude, and responded to with an unanimity and a fervour which read the ministry of the day a most impressive and long-remembered lesson. The episcopal body is in general inclined, both from principle and inclination, to cultivate amicable relations with the existing government; and it is quite right that this should be the case; but most assuredly a more serious evil could not befal the Church than any apparent or real want of firmness, or subserviency to the government of the day, in questions *vitally affecting the interests of the Church.* It is not merely that in the event of such want of firmness, measures of an injurious character to the Church are *certain* to be carried; but the Church generally is dispirited, and even indignant on finding itself without leaders; and feelings may hence be engendered, which might be far more perilous to the interests of the Church and to the influence of the hierarchy, than any injuries from without.

The Church might be ruined by rash and ill-considered measures of opposition to the government of the day. We readily admit this. But, on the other hand, it may, as certainly, be ruined by timidity and vacillation. What is to be hoped for in the event of any such disastrous circumstances as seem to be impending over us, is an immoveable firmness, resolution, and perseverance combined with discretion. That firmness on matters of principle will meet with respect, and ultimately gain its objects, is exemplified by the struggle between the Roman Catholic

Church and the State in Prussia. The Roman Catholic Church in Prussia holds a position of much less influence and power than the English Church does in England. The monarchy, again, is an absolute one, and therefore more powerful than the State in England. And yet in this contest the Church prevailed.

Now, again, let us look to the course pursued in England. We have seen that the Church was strongest, and the hierarchy most respected, when, at a great crisis, the heads of the Church courageously, and at all hazards, defended the rights of that great interest which was entrusted to their care. Now look on the other side of the picture. We need scarcely disclaim any feeling but that of the highest respect for the motives of the large body of prelates who voted for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts in 1828. Doubtless those excellent men were of opinion that they could not safely oppose a measure introduced by the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. They did not perceive, apparently, that this measure led, by necessary consequence, to Roman Catholic emancipation—that the latter could not be refused on any reasonable and intelligible grounds when the former had been conceded. In 1829, then, the heads of the Church were called upon to assent to a measure of emancipation proposed by the same ministry—a measure far more wide and comprehensive, and more destitute of securities than any of the Roman Catholic advocates had ever dared to propose. There was not the same unanimity in the votes of the hierarchy on this occasion, as there had been in the preceding year—they were divided: but a *strong minority of bishops* voted for emancipation. There was another question of vital importance to the Church, we allude to the Church Temporalities Act for Ireland. On this occasion, too, the episcopal bench were *divided:* a large minority voted for the measure. Now we are not attempting to express any opinion on the conduct of the prelates who thus took part with the government of the day, and in decided opposition to the wishes of the great body of the clergy and people. We merely wish to observe, that these concessions only led to increased demands, and that the Church and the hierarchy itself were immediately subjected to the most violent attacks. We can recollect that these acts of the hierarchy were held up to public execration in terms which we should be unwilling to employ. Men felt very generally that the first and highest interests of the Church had been sacrificed to the supposed interests of an administration, or to the convenience of political parties. And they accordingly felt very little inclination to lend their support to the hierarchy, when Radicalism raised its outcry for the expulsion of the Bishops from the House of Lords, and the reform of the

Church. We are merely stating historical facts, not attempting to express any opinion as to the propriety of the course pursued, or the feelings indulged in. The fact was, that a large part of the community who had always been devoted friends of the Church, were disgusted at the conduct of many of the bishops in voting against, what were generally held to be, the Church's interests; and they contributed, for the time, to swell the feeling of hostility against the hierarchy existing in other quarters. And the result was, that the expulsion of the Bishops from the House of Lords was very near being carried. Their escape was a very narrow one. The church-rates were only saved by an opposite line of conduct. The Tithes in Ireland were rescued by miracle, and with the sacrifice of a great portion of their value. We do not attribute any blame to the prelates who evinced so conciliatory and compliant a disposition in conceding to the wishes of government on these occasions; but we cannot help feeling that the dangers of the Church at that time arose in some degree from the course which the hierarchy thought it advisable to pursue.

The course of events has again, most singularly, come round within the last year or two, to the same state in many respects as was witnessed in 1828 and 1829. The resemblance is, in many respects, truly extraordinary; and more especially so, in the very same set of ministers being a second time in the direction of public affairs. In 1828, Sir Robert Peel's ministry adopted a course of policy entirely opposed to all its former principles and conduct, and the Parliament, including the episcopal bench, sanctioned its "liberal" policy. In 1845, the same government set itself to conciliate Romanism; introduced the Maynooth and the Irish Colleges Bills, and threw itself on the support of the "Liberal" party. In this course it was supported by a portion of its so-called "conservative" adherents, and by about one-half of the episcopal bench. In 1829, the same administration took a great step in advance of their policy of 1828, and were followed by a considerable body of the hierarchy. In 1846, the same administration has again advanced in the same career; and their Corn Bill has received the support of *two-thirds* of the episcopal bench.

Absit omen! We most devoutly hope that the parallel may here come to an end. We hope that the hierarchy will not be placed in the same danger which surrounded it from 1829 to 1834. It has certainly been a subject of serious anxiety to many well-wishers of the Church, to observe that the measures of last year, which were generally most obnoxious to the people of this country, and which were supposed to be calcu-

lated to encourage and strengthen the cause of Romanism, did not meet with the unanimous opposition of the hierarchy; while of two measures seriously affecting the interests of the Church introduced this session of parliament, one, namely, the Corn Bill, has been supported by two-thirds of the episcopal bench; and the other, namely, the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill," has been permitted to pass through the House of Lords without any strenuous opposition except from the Bishop of Exeter.

In the Maynooth Bill and the Irish Colleges Bill of last year, the real question which lay concealed under these measures was, whether the Church of Ireland should any longer be treated as the established religion of the State; or whether the patronage of the State should be equally extended to all forms of religion, and the claims of the Church be set aside. This was the question which was tried afresh last year, and which was determined against the Church by the ministers. We need not say how great a breach was thus made in the principles of the constitution. It was a grand step towards the proclamation of an equality amongst all forms of religion, and therefore the downfal of the Established Church. It affected the Church of Ireland immediately, but it also indirectly affected the Church of England. Nothing could be more lamentable than to see the narrow views which so many worthy men took of these measures; as if nothing had been involved in them but a mere expenditure of 30,000*l*., instead of 10,000*l*., or the erection of additional schools.

Now to come to the measures of the present year. Of the Corn-law Bill we shall not speak at any length, because our readers must be weary of the subject. All we would say is this: The bill is a tremendous experiment; no one can tell what its results will be; it may *not* diminish materially the price of corn, or throw large tracts of land out of cultivation, or increase the poor-rates, or produce any other of the evils which its opponents anticipate. But, on the other hand, it certainly *may* do all this. No one can tell with any certainty what its effects will be. It may ruin large numbers of the labourers, the farmers, and the gentry of England and Ireland. It may cause extensive changes of property. And, what is more to our present purpose, *it may largely reduce the value of the Church property;* while it may operate *a very great change in the disposition of the agricultural interest towards the Church.* Hitherto the Church has been identified with the agricultural interest. Such, at least, has been the impression of agriculturists.

But what may be the state of the case hereafter? What, if agriculturists, exasperated at the sacrifice of their interests by a ministry whom they had elevated to power, and experiencing

serious injury to their pecuniary interests, should look to relief from the various burdens on agriculture? What, if they should fix upon the tithe, and ask for its abolition? What, if they should agitate for the transfer of this charge to the consolidated fund, or to the ordinary estimates for each year? What, if they should feel that the Church having taken a part *against* them in the great struggle which they had made, *her* interests might just as well be placed in jeopardy as theirs? What, if the agricultural interest should in the pressure of distress, be tempted by offers from its opponents of relief, on condition of concurring in measures for the alienation of Church property? We most fervently hope, that none of these fearful contingencies may occur; but at the same time we are not ignorant that the Protectionists have distinctly stated in the course of the struggle, that tithes are a *burden on land*, and that some of them have been inclined to recommend the transfer of this burden to the public revenue. There are abundant indications of the danger in which the interests of the Church are placed in this direction.

We extract with pain the following passage from a communication in a recent number of a Conservative and Protectionist journal. While we feel it our duty to lay the opinions it expresses before our readers, we need not say that we lament the tone and tendency of the writer:—

"If ever there was a measure introduced into the House of Peers, which judged by the principles of religion, charity, and justice, should have met the strenuous opposition of the whole bench of bishops, it is the repeal of the Corn Laws. Whether we look to its origin, which is founded in treachery and fraud, or to its aim and object, which is to lower the wages of the artizan, to deprive the agricultural peasant of his employment, to grind the poor to the earth, and to raise on their prostrate bodies the dominion of the scheming speculative millionaire, we see motives the strongest that can be conceived, as operating in a religious, honourable, and benevolent mind, to excite ardent hostility to this iniquitous bill. When we add to the motives I have enumerated, that the bishops are the selected guardians of the whole body of the beneficed clergy, and that upon their votes it mainly depends whether the incomes of the rectors and curates of our Church shall be reduced at least one-fourth, and distress and worldly anxieties introduced into the families of those who, for the general benefit of mankind, should be preserved from necessity, and enabled to give their time and attention to spiritual labours, I think a case will be made out against them, the strongest which the history of this country can produce, of a gross dereliction of duty, and a glaring abandonment of all those feelings by which religious and honourable men ought to be guided in the use to be made of those privileges which have been intrusted to them by the Constitution. Far be it from me to include in this censure the noble-minded men who have pre-

served their honour and their principles untarnished, uninfluenced by the hope of future promotion, or by the miserable hankering after the flesh-pots of Egypt, which has led seventeen of their body from the straight path of duty, religion, and charity; but the few will suffer for the delinquences of the many, and their spiritual lordships may rely on it, that thousands who would have cheerfully shed their blood to preserve the privileges of the heads of the Church to which they are sincerely attached, will be led by this glaring instance of defection from every principle by which such men should have been guided, to view with apathy, if not with pleasure, the degradation of the episcopal order, which will be one of their surest consequences of the advent to power of that party which their late vote has so greatly contributed to place at the helm of the State."

For ourselves we do not presume to express any opinion on the recent vote of the hierarchy in support of free-trade. It arose, of course, from mature consideration of the general interests of the Church, rather than of those of any set of ministers, or of any political party.

We now come to the second measure of this year affecting the interests of the Establishment. We allude to the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill," which has been introduced by the present ministry, and which has been suffered to proceed through the House of Lords, without any direct opposition, except from the Bishop of Exeter, while it has been warmly supported by other prelates. To the Bishop of Exeter, in our opinion, the gratitude of every friend of the Church is due for the firm and resolute stand which he took against this measure, and we cannot avoid a feeling of disappointment that he was left to fight the battle alone. There seems to be at present little prospect of this bill becoming an Act of the Legislature; but it appears to involve questions of such grave importance, and questions, too, which seem to have been entirely overlooked in the discussion; that, as such a bill is sure to make its re-appearance in the very next session of parliament, it ought to be most seriously considered by every friend of the Church in the mean time.

Public attention has not been much directed to this measure. Engrossed as every one has been with the more prominent question of the day, the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill" would apparently have passed without notice into law, but for the opposition of the Bishop of Exeter, and the praiseworthy exertions of the National Club, in convening a public meeting at Willis's rooms on the 2nd of May, at which resolutions against the bill were agreed on.

We admit that at the first view of the case, nothing can be more plausible than the arguments produced by the Lord Chancellor and the supporters of the bill. "How absurd and how

useless must it be," they argue, "to retain penalties which can be no longer enforced—to inflict fines and imprisonment for the assertion of the papal supremacy, the introduction of papal bulls, the celebration of mass, the attendance on conventicles, the non-attendance at church, and the other religious offences for which penalties are provided in the old statutes, but which became wholly obsolete as soon as the Acts for the Toleration of Protestant and Romish dissenters were passed. To retain such Acts and penalties on the Statute-book any longer is a mere absurdity, and is a needless insult to Romanists and other dissenters." This is the plain and simple case put forward by the supporters of this bill, and of Mr. Watson's bill in the House of Commons; and it must be admitted that these arguments are plausible enough at first sight. But there are objections also on the face of the subject, which are of no inconsiderable moment. The first relates to the Queen's Supremacy, which would undoubtedly be compromised by the enactment of this Bill. This may perhaps be a matter which concerns the State more directly than the Church; but it very nearly concerns the Church as a national establishment. Dr. Wordsworth's remarks on this subject are worthy of attention. He argues that to repeal the Acts requiring the Oath of Supremacy to be taken (as far as regards Romanists), would be tantamount to legalizing a public profession on their parts that they are not subjects of the Crown.—p. 52. But there is another objection which was very forcibly urged at the meeting above referred to, in the following terms:—

"It so happens that these very bills (the Lord Chancellor's and Mr. Watson's), intended to relieve the Roman Catholics from a difficulty of their own choosing, the difficulty of a divided allegiance, involve a most monstrous aggression upon the consciences of the clergy of the Church of England. They are at their ordination, and again at their institution to any spiritual charge, each time solemnly called on to declare, as God shall be their helper, 'that no foreign prince, prelate, state or potentate, *hath, or ought to have,* any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.' From the taking of this oath, the bill of the Lord Chancellor does not relieve the clergy; and the bill of Mr. Watson expressly provides, that it shall still be incumbent upon them to take it: the effect of which would be, if these bills should become the law of the land, that the clergy of the Church of England would be called upon to deny upon oath the pope's jurisdiction, both *de facto* and *de jure, in the face of statutes formally admitting and sanctioning that jurisdiction*[1]."

This is a serious consideration as regards the position of the clergy, which would certainly be rendered most embarrassing by

[1] Speech of the Rev. Dr. Biber at the Meeting, May 2. Report, pp. 37, 38.

the passing of such a measure: but we think the case is yet more serious as regards the Crown itself. By these measures the legislature would *formally sanction certain classes of the community in rejecting the regal supremacy in religious matters.* This liberty would, in fact, be extended to every religious sect and denomination, except to the Church of England. If this should be the case, it is not easy to see on what ground the Crown could any longer pretend to supremacy over the English Church. If the essential rights of the Crown are not infringed by the denial of the supremacy in one case, would they be infringed by a similar rejection in the other? The whole argument of those who would maintain the supremacy of the Crown would be cut from under them. The Crown would have pronounced its own abdication of the ecclesiastical supremacy, it could no longer claim any authority founded on Holy Scripture, or on common law, to a supremacy over its subjects, as such, in religious matters. Its supremacy over the English Church would from that moment be reduced from Divine right and immemorial privilege, extending to the nation at large, to a mere statutory enactment affecting only a certain class of its subjects, and which might at any moment be unmade by the same legislative power which made it. The Church and the State would be directly at issue: the latter denying, and the former affirming the royal supremacy over all estates and degrees of men in the kingdom. The Church only recognizes the claim on scriptural and religious grounds; but if the State *denies* the validity of these grounds, it will be quite impossible to prevent the ultimate ruin of the royal supremacy. On what *principle* could the State pretend to the exclusive right of summoning synods, or of confirming canons, or of legislating on ecclesiastical matters, if it formally relinquished this right in the case of Romanists and Dissenters? It would from that moment rest on mere statute, and not on any higher ground. And as to the appointment to bishoprics, it could in future be defended only on the ground of statute, and of the alleged *foundation* of all sees by the Crown, which is in many cases a legal fiction, and which, being a mere right of property, might be alienated by the Crown with as much facility as its crown-lands.

We have already spoken of the inconvenience to the temporal power, which may result from the legal recognition of the papal jurisdiction. This furnishes another objection to the removal of all barriers to the open and unchecked exercise of that jurisdiction. We must extract the following instructive and curious statement from the report of the meeting above referred to:—

"At the time of the Reformation, the Romish Church was altogether

banished from Geneva, as it was from this country, by severe legal enactments; these remained in force until the incorporation of the Genevese republic with the French empire. It was then that the Roman Catholic Church was, for the first time, readmitted within the gates of Geneva; one of the city churches, curiously enough the church of St. Germain, in which the Reformation begun, was appropriated for its worship; and, by degrees, a Roman Catholic population collected, which, in the year 1814, amounted to 2000. By the treaty of Vienna, which restored to Geneva its independent sovereignty, the territory of the republic was increased by the addition of twenty-one parishes, two of them town, and the rest country parishes, which had belonged partly to Piedmont, and partly to France. The population of these new districts was Roman Catholic, and by way of conciliating their new fellow-citizens, the Genevese not only granted free toleration and equality of civil rights to the Roman Catholics, but they built several new churches and a number of schools for them, and made provision for the payment of the Romish clergy and schoolmasters out of the public funds. So much for the liberality of the Protestant government of Geneva: now for the return which it met with at the hands of the Romish party. The principal priest (*archiprêtre*) of the Roman Catholic Church at Geneva was a man named Vuarin, a man of great ability, energy, and perseverance. He undertook to catholicize the city of Calvin; and he did it in this way. Whatever shops or other business premises in the town fell vacant, he contrived to secure, and put into them Roman Catholics from the country parishes, who were allowed to occupy them rent free for a year or two, on condition that, when they were properly established in their business, they should either remove to some other part of the town, or pay rent, so as to enable him to take other places for new comers. At the same time, he required of all these settlers, that they should employ no other than Roman Catholic servants, and give their custom exclusively to Roman Catholic dealers. By these means, and having large sums of money placed at his disposal, for the purpose of carrying on his operations, Vuarin succeeded in raising the Roman Catholic population of Geneva from 2000, which was the number in 1814, to 8000, which it was in 1844. The numerical strength of the Roman Catholics being thus brought within 2000 of the numerical strength of the Protestants, Vuarin thought himself strong enough to commence a system of open aggression; further rights and privileges are demanded, and various grievances got up. One of the latter was, *that the Protestant clergy refused to take off their hats when meeting the host carried in procession;* the education question furnished another topic of complaint; and by an alliance with the radicals, an extension of the right of voting was obtained, which increased the political power of the Romanists.

"Meanwhile Vuarin died in 1844, and the appointment of his successor became the occasion of an open conflict between the Romish hierarchy and the government of Geneva. The latter had, by this time, become fully alive to the dangerous character of the machinations which

had been so successfully carried on, and when the Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva nominated Marilley, Vuarin's curate, and his coadjutor in all his proceedings, as his successor, the government exercised the right of putting their *veto* upon the nomination . . . . The bishop, however, denied the right of the government to interfere with his nomination, and persisted in forcing his nominee, Marilley, upon the republic. The government, on the other hand, determined to maintain their right, and intimated to Marilley that if he attempted to assume the government of the Roman Catholic Church at Geneva, they would cause him to be transported beyond the frontiers of the republic. Marilley, acting under the orders of the bishop, set the government at defiance, and drove them to the extreme measure of having him removed from their territory in the custody of two gendarmes. This was precisely what the Romish party desired; the cry of persecution was raised; the bishop caused a protest against the proceedings of the government to be publicly read in the Roman Catholic church at Geneva. He confirmed Marilley in his office, appointed a *locum tenens* for the performance of his sacerdotal functions *pendente lite*, and to crown the whole, carried the cause by appeal to Rome. Thus was Geneva, that chief city of continental Protestantism, after the lapse of 300 years, again placed in the position of appearing as a suitor at the court of the Roman pontiff. And how did Rome deal with the case? Before the cause was ripe for decision, it so happened that the see of Lausanne and Geneva became vacant by the death of the bishop, whereupon the pope appointed Marilley as his successor, thus inflicting upon the government of Geneva in the character of bishop, the very man whom they had refused to receive as priest!"

"This is a fair specimen of the way in which concessions to the Romish Church are abused, for the purpose of treading under foot the independence of nations and the rights of sovereign states. As it happened at Geneva, so you may rest assured will it happen to us, if we continue that over liberal course of policy which has of late years been pursued. Let these bills, which virtually repeal the Act of Supremacy, and recognize the papal jurisdiction, be suffered to pass into law, and the time will soon arrive when England will have to appear as a suitor before the papal court, and the jurisdiction of the Lord High Chancellor [may we not add that of the Parliament and Crown?] of England be superseded by the superior jurisdiction of the Chancery of Rome."

We have seldom perused a more striking and remarkable delineation of the working of Romanism to attain supremacy. Romanism is every where the same in spirit. It is always equally aspiring, crafty, and bold in its policy. Such facts as these will show how it avails itself of free political institutions, and how inadequate its opponents are to cope with the unwearied energy of purpose, the exhaustless resource and fertility of machination which the Jesuits bring to bear on their object. We should have no apprehension, if the prevalence of one cause or the other were

left to be determined by legitimate modes of argument and persuasion; but when in the face of the unwearied machinations and efforts of Romanism, we see Protestantism relinquishing all the political principles and institutions which protect the doctrines of the Reformation from open aggression; when we see barrier after barrier cast down by the unsuspecting facility of those who are the natural guardians of the Established Church; when we see concession after concession made to those who are stedfastly bent on the destruction of that Church, and who merely wait their opportunity to exchange the tone of affected liberality for a stern and deadly struggle for her annihilation; when we see them willing on all occasions to make common cause with Radicalism for the attainment of increased political power, and actually, year by year, gaining greater and greater power to accomplish their ultimate objects; when we see that by combination with those who abhor their religious tenets, they are able to advance step by step towards the overthrow of the only effectual impediment to the general progress of their religious system; when we see this course successfully pursued for a long series of years; and when, notwithstanding all the warnings that have been offered by experience and history—notwithstanding all the strongest protests of the *people* of England,—statesmen, and *conservative* statesmen, and what is still worse, *bishops*, will lend their support to the political cause of Romanism—we confess that we are inclined to despair for the Church. If bishops themselves, at this time of the day, are blind to the signs of the times,—if prelates of the Church are deluded and beguiled by the pretences of the Jesuits, and lend the weight of their support to the passing of measures which tend to the utter destruction of the Church, we can only say that they ought to be held chiefly responsible for what may occur. And if, in consequence of their fatal and inexcusable rashness, we should live to see those very prelates driven from the House of Lords, and despoiled of their incomes and their patronage, who will not feel that they have richly earned the retribution? Who will not point to them as the chief authors of the downfall of the Church?

A consideration of the alarming advances in power made by Romanism in the last twenty or thirty years, ought of itself to prevent any friend of the Church from assisting in its further progress. We confess that we address ourselves to the mere "Establishment" view of the case principally. We are desirous of making some impression on those who are disposed to take a higher view of the advantages of the temporal establishment of religion than even we do; we are appealing to those who regard the Church as little more than the creature of the State, and who

cannot conceive her existence if the bond of union between Church and State were severed. We say to them, that in proportion as they deem the Church to be dependent on the State, so should they struggle to prevent the State from adopting principles which lead necessarily to the destruction of any exclusive establishment of religion.

It is evident that our statesmen, with all the confidence which they undeniably possess in their skill in the art and craft of statesmanship, are no matches for the Jesuits. English diplomacy has always been foiled in its negotiations with Russian, Austrian, and French cunning; and honest John Bull has invariably fought the battles, of which his neighbours have carried off the spoils. In the same way our statesmen have attempted to negotiate with the Jesuits, and they have been regularly made tools of Rome. Able as Lord Lyndhurst is in his legal and official capacity, he has proved himself capable of being made the dupe of Jesuitism. We will not do the noble lord or his colleagues the injustice of supposing that they have any principles opposed to the existence of an Established Church. Many circumstances render such a notion altogether incredible. But notwithstanding this, the ministry in proposing the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill," have been striking a tremendous blow at the foundation of the National Establishment. We have sometimes heard, what we considered at the time mere vain and absurd boasts of Romanists, that they expected soon to see mass celebrated in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. Ridiculous as such expectations seem to be, there is every reason to expect that they will be realized ere long, if measures like that of the Lord Chancellor pass into law. We shall presently state our reasons for this opinion, but in the mean time, we are anxious to draw attention to the following remarkable exposition of the designs and plans of Romanism in this country for attaining ultimate ascendancy[2].

"This is the critical moment when it will be decided, whether as a nation, and a Church, we shall make a determined stand against the papacy, or whether we shall fall prostrate under its anti-Christian power. . . . . I am only stating to you that which the Romanists themselves have deliberately placed on record, as the object of their strenuous endeavours, and their sanguine expectations. If the meeting will give me leave, I will refer, in proof of this assertion, to a few extracts from a work which I met with at Paris, and brought over with me two years ago. The author of it is M. Jules Gondon, one of the editors of the *Univers*, the recognized organ of the Ultramontane party in France; its title, 'The Religious Movement in England; or, the progress of Catholicism, and the return of the Anglican Church to

[2] Speech of the Rev. Dr. Biber, Report of Meeting, May 2, pp. 29—31.

Unity.' . . . All the points and bearings of the question are seriously and deliberately argued by the author, with a view to show that England ought to be, and shortly will be a Roman Catholic country . . . Without any circumlocution M. Gondon accounts for the passing of the Bill of 1829, by the fact, that '*the Catholic Association of Ireland had raised up in that country a government more formidable than that of England.* The circumstances,' he continues, 'were nearly identical with *those which at present result from the Repeal Association.* The Emancipation Bill, it is true, contained some restrictive clauses, but these restrictions,' M. Gondon here enumerates them, and then contemptuously adds, '*these restrictions were of little consequence; the essential point was to get the principle admitted; that principle the Parliament proclaimed;* THE DEVELOPMENT OF ITS CONSEQUENCES WAS LEFT TO THE FUTURE.'"

The development of these consequences is then traced in the progress of the religious organization of Romanism in England—the increase of their numbers—the multiplication of churches and chapels, monasteries, convents, and confraternities. Their hierarchy has been doubled in England since the Bill of 1829: the same course has been followed in all the English Colonies and dependencies. The funds of the Propaganda of Lyons have within ten years been poured into England and its Colonies in a continually increasing ratio, so that while in 1835 the sum expended was 980*l.*, in 1844 it had risen to 40,865*l.*

"Another point which the Papists are keeping steadily in view, and which, according to M. Gondon, they hope ere long to accomplish, is the overthrow of the Protestant character of our ancient Universities. In the first instance, they have been content to get a footing in England for academical institutions of their own. The Jesuit College at Stonyhurst has been in operation for a number of years; and more recently, the Romish colleges of St. Mary Oscott, and St. Cuthbert, Durham, have been incorporated with the London University. But this, though it meets every fair claim of toleration, does not satisfy those whose object is not toleration but ascendancy. So long as Oxford and Cambridge remain exclusively Protestant Universities, the Papists have a grievance; and M. Gondon tells us what their plan is for obtaining its removal. 'Since 1840,' he says, 'numerous attempts have been made to obtain an extension of these liberal principles;'—the principles, that is to say, on which the London University obtained a charter which permitted the incorporation of Popish Colleges;—'Ireland has agitated for the introduction of Catholic professors at the University of Dublin, England will as much as possible retard the moment of granting this privilege, for fear of a reaction upon its own Universities; but she will not always be able to refuse this act of justice to the Catholics of Ireland. *Fear*,'—observe the insulting taunt by which our foolish liberality is recompensed,—'*fear will extort*

from her, as heretofore, what she does not grant of good will; and the Catholics of England will know how to turn this encouragement to account:' which phrase M. Gondon afterwards explains to mean, that they will insist on the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge being thrown open to the Romanists."

M. Gondon then explains the working of the Catholic Institute, the idea of which is, to "unite in one body all the Catholics contained in Great Britain," and to obtain subscriptions from every individual member of their communion. "The results of such a combination," says M. Gondon, "are truly incalculable."

"Some of these results have been already accomplished, others are yet in progress; and it is surely not too much to say that the bills of the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Watson for the more effectual advancement of popery, are to be reckoned amongst them . . . 'It has been settled,'—observe, this is the statement of the Romish party themselves, as to their mode of proceeding,—'it has been settled as a general principle, that the Catholics are to vote in a body; so as to enable them to give the decision between two parties about equally balanced. *Candidates expecting the votes of the Catholic body, must give a specific pledge to be on all occasions the defenders and advocates of the religious rights and interests of the Catholics throughout the whole extent of the Empire, subject to the British sceptre.*"

But we now come to what is of still more importance, as bearing on the proceedings of the present Administration in their measure for the protection of Roman Catholic charities, their concession of the rank of "Bishop" and "Archbishop" to the Romish hierarchy, their endowment of Maynooth, and their proposal to repeal all statutes condemnatory of Romanism.

"In this point of view the following statement of M. Gondon, deserves particular attention:—'The importance which the Catholics had acquired, *was one of the first questions which occupied the statesman, whom the elections of* 1841 *had called to the helm.* Hearing of numerous conversions in the inferior classes of society, observing that religious fraternities of both men and women were being organized every where, the Government wished to know the real objects of these associations, and to make sure that this considerable increase of the children of the Roman Church portended no design to the social condition of Britain. *A secret inquiry was set on foot by the Government,* and the ministry was informed that every where, in the manufacturing and agricultural districts, the Catholics form a select body, distinguished by its knowledge, its morality, and its love of order. According to the reports of the manufacturers, the Catholics are the most laborious and best disciplined workmen; they always keep aloof from the leaders of disunion and disorder. It required no more than this to determine the Government to let things take their

course, *without endeavouring to impede in any way the general tendency which manifests itself towards a religious system formerly condemned by the laws of the State.* Thus the regenerating action of Catholicism makes itself felt in a social point of view.' Further on we learn from M. Gondon's book, that 'SINCE 1842, THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE CATHOLIC INSTITUTE HAS BEEN IN COMMUNICATION WITH SEVERAL MEMBERS OF THE CABINET,' AND THAT THE CONCESSIONS MADE TO ROMAN CATHOLICS HAVE BEEN THE RESULTS OF THAT COMMUNICATION."

And this brings us again to Lord Lyndhurst's Bill. The Romanist authority just quoted, leads to the suspicion that this bill was concocted by the "Catholic Institute." Similar bills have been brought in for the last session or two by Romanists—one we believe by Serjeant Murphy in the House of Commons, and another by Lord Beaumont in the House of Lords. The repeal of the old statutes against Romanism and other forms of religious dissent, have been for some time pressed on various occasions by Romanists. It has at length, most probably at the instance of the "Catholic Institute," been formally taken up by the present ministry.

Now, in examining the real character of this measure, we may be permitted to ask, *why Romanists have been so very anxious for it?* It is not pretended that any of the penalties against their religion are now in force. It is not pretended that the Act of Emancipation in 1829 left them subject to any danger of persecution from these laws. Nothing could be so absurd as such a notion. No one asserts that it is the case. The Lord Chancellor and the advocates of the bill do not venture to say that any relief is needed from positive penalties. *Why then is the repeal of these statutes sought for*, when they are wholly suspended from operation, and no one suffers from them? Will any one believe that Romanists seek their repeal merely because they deem their existence an *insult* to their religion? We can only say that if the supporters of the measure are taken in by mere pretences like this, the credulity of some men of the world is truly marvellous. Does any one who understands Jesuitism suppose that it has not some design deeper than is apparent, when it complains of "insults" being offered to religion? Look at the measure, and see whether the real designs of Jesuitism cannot be distinctly traced in it? Here is a measure which is to remove *no one real grievance*—Thus much is admitted. What then is the object?

The bill is simply to repeal every shred and vestige of the old enactments against those who dissent from the established religion of the State. If it should pass, *there would not be a*

single remaining proof on the statute-book, that the State had ever disapproved of dissent from the National Church, or that it ever held it the duty of the nation to embrace that form of religion. Let this bill pass, and the whole theory of the constitution as regards religion is at once altered. Hitherto the doctrine of the Law of England has been, that the Church is recognized and established by the State as the true religion; that the State holds it to be the duty of all its subjects to adhere to the Church; but that it does not any longer compel schismatics to conformity by temporal penalties, as it once did: it *tolerates what it cannot approve or encourage.* This is the principle of *toleration*, which involves necessarily the supremacy of an established Church, and its peculiar adoption by the State. But as soon as this bill passes, the whole doctrine of toleration is at an end. The State will have declared that it recognizes no superiority of one form of religion to another. It will have blotted from its Statute Book the whole body of laws, which in the course of successive ages attested its preference for the Church of England, and which continue to attest it. By this single act, *the State will have recognized the equality of all sects:* it will have established the principle that they are all to be viewed with equal favour—that there is to be no further preference.

Such is the object which Romanists and all other sectarians have been aiming at for years. They repudiate the notion of toleration, and demand *equality of rights.* The demand must by this time be familiar to all our readers. It is *conceded* by the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill." Let this bill become law; and the mistaken liberality which has allowed it to pass, will ere long find it bearing bitter fruits. Romanists will be quite satisfied to have gained the concession of the principle, and will wait a little before it is pushed home to its conclusions. What are those conclusions?

The principle established by the bill is, *the full equality of all religious sects in the eye of the law*—their perfect equality in rights. On this principle, how will it be any longer possible to defend the exclusive possession of seats in Parliament by the "Anglican" bishops? This constitutes a decided inequality between the English Church and other religious sects. Consequently either the bishops must be expelled from the House of Lords, or other sects must have representatives there. The former alternative is, of course, that which would be adopted. Now just let us pause for a moment on this question. We recollect the violent exertion made for the expulsion of the bishops from Parliament in 1830—1834. That the danger was very great, we suppose no one will deny. It was generally supposed that the bench were in no small

degree alarmed at it. The first report of the ecclesiastical commissioners in 1835, is believed to have been materially influenced by it. According to the common report the see of Man was suppressed because it afforded the dangerous precedent of a bishopric without a seat in Parliament; and the total number of dioceses in England was not to be increased, (notwithstanding the evident desirableness of some increase, and the universal cry of the Church for it,) because the number of spiritual peers could not be augmented, and the commissioners feared the precedent of the appointment of bishops *without seats in Parliament.* If these reports were well founded, the Church certainly paid most dearly for the privilege of parliamentary seats for her bishops. The spiritual advantage of the Church was prevented by the apprehension of losing parliamentary rank! However this may be, it certainly showed a very great apprehension of the uncertain tenure of seats in the House of Lords. Again, in the very last session of Parliament, Lord Stanley, then Secretary for the Colonies, and now —observe this point—*the leader of the Protectionist party*—warned the bishops, that the creation of *a single additional bishop without a seat in Parliament, would endanger the seats of the whole hierarchy!* He remarked that many very excellent persons were of opinion, that the bishops would be more efficient if they were removed from Parliament. These were ominous words. Now let us look in another direction. There are unquestionably many very well-disposed persons, of high character, and friends of the Church, who have long been anxious to see an increase in the hierarchy, and who have learnt gradually that the seats in Parliament constitute the only real obstacle to a measure which they deem of far more importance than the preservation of parliamentary seats. Such persons have, in many cases, ceased to wish for the preservation of the latter privilege; and would even be rather glad to see it abolished. Further, many of the Protectionist party have taken offence at the recent support of the ministerial policy by the episcopal bench. We doubt whether the hierarchy can look to the Protectionists for the support of their parliamentary privileges. To whom then are they to look? Not to the present government: not to the Radicals or Free-traders, for they are the natural enemies of the hierarchy, and will be immediately open-mouthed for its destruction. Not, we fear, to the Whigs, for they would sacrifice the hierarchy without scruple if it suited their interests to do so. What hope then would there be of resisting the demands of the Radicals and Romanists for the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords, if this bill were to pass, and this natural inference were to be drawn from it? We confess that we are not sanguine as to the result. It is our painful apprehension, that if such events

should take place,—if such measures should pass without the strenuous and *united* opposition of the hierarchy,—and if there should be any more instances of want of firmness and resolution in maintaining what is considered by most persons to be the cause of the Church, the hierarchy would fall; we do not say, without any struggle; because, thank Heaven, there are those who would support it under all circumstances; but without any powerful or lengthened resistance.

Let us suppose the enemies of the Church to have gained from the unsuspecting facility of its friends, the concession of the principle of Lord Lyndhurst's bill, namely, the equality of all religious sects in the eye of the law. And let us suppose them to demand the expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords as a necessary consequence of the principle thus admitted. On what grounds could they be resisted? It would be in vain to appeal to the old principle of the constitution which recognizes a National Church. This ground would have been cut away. It would be in vain to argue that the Church ought to be *represented* in Parliament: the answer would be, that if so, *all sects* ought to be equally represented; which being impossible, the Church must be placed on a level with other sects. It would be vain to appeal to vested rights and immemorial privileges. The Corn-law Bill, and the Irish Church Temporalities Bill, and the Irish Tithe Bill, have interfered with vested rights and immemorial privileges. We might urge the benefit derived from the presence of the ministers of religion in the deliberations of Parliament. We should be met by those who would assure us that the *House of Commons* continues to get on admirably without the presence of any clergy; and would remind us that seats in Parliament detain the hierarchy from the discharge of their duties in their dioceses. We should be assured that the possession of this privilege only renders the bishops obsequious followers of the ministry; and that it makes too marked a distinction between the first and second order of the clergy. We should urge, in reply, the evil and danger of removing the bishops from the House of Lords, as a step to the total separation of Church and State. The reply would be, that the principle of total separation, *i. e.* of perfect indifference, or equal favour to all religious sects, had been conceded by the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill," *which the bishops themselves had supported.* We fear then, that as far as argument was concerned, the opponents of the hierarchy would have the advantage very decisively.

Since the above passage was written, we have observed some further evidences of the extremely critical position in which the hierarchy is now placed.

An appeal of the most forcible description had been made to

the spiritual lords by the Marquis of Exeter. His lordship had urged upon the episcopal bench the difficulties to which this measure might reduce the parochial clergy, whose interests the bishops were especially commissioned to defend. We cite the report of his speech :—

"I cannot help expressing my great regret, that many of the right reverend prelates, for whom I have the highest respect, should have thought it their duty to vote for the second reading of this bill. I had expected, *as they are the only representatives of the clergy*, whose interests will suffer so extremely from this measure, that they would have opposed it as a measure most hurtful to the interests of the Church. *My surprise is, that many of those who have been asserting the necessity of augmenting poorer livings*, and using their best exertions to carry out the object of the present commission, should have voted for a measure that must indisputably affect the incomes of the poorer clergy, and stultify, such would be the effect, all they have been doing to augment them during the last few years. I can assure the right reverend bench, that their clergy will feel their desertion most acutely. I had some conversation with several, in which I told them, that I had heard reports that the bishops intended to support the measure, but one and all declared, that they did not think the right reverend bench would so betray their trust."

The Bishop of St. David's, according to the report of his speech, thus addressed himself to the question :—

"He wished to say a few words in his own defence; for their lordships could not have forgotten that in the course of the recent discussion very numerous appeals—very solemn, emphatic, and earnest appeals, had been made by a great number of noble lords, and he must be permitted to say in a very unusual strain, to those who occupied a place in that part of the house (the right reverend bench), *and they must also be aware that they were of such a nature as to involve very serious charges against that portion of their lordships' house, who held the opinions which he* (the Bishop of St. David's) *held*. . . . The right reverend members of the bench on which he sat, *were considered to be the representatives of the interests of the clergy*, and it was on those grounds himself and his colleagues had been urged to give a vote against the measure which appeared to threaten the interest of that body. But what was the proceeding of the noble lords themselves upon the measure? Did they not most emphatically and indignantly repudiate the consideration of the question as a landlords' or a personal question, or that the measure was one calculated for the interests of a class only? It appeared to him, therefore, rather inconsistent, that though they put away from themselves all personal consideration, they nevertheless asked the right reverend bench to vote against the measure, on the ground that if passed, it would affect *their* interests. . . . The clergy *had no apprehensions of this kind themselves*. . . . He rejoiced that no unanimity on the present bill

appeared amongst the right reverend prelates, because it was to him, and it would be to the world, *a conviction that they had been guided by their own convictions, and by no other consideration. . . . Whatever loss the clergy might be considered to bear*, it appeared to him that they would receive but *little injury*. . . . He would only say, that *the great body of the clergy had no desire that their votes should be influenced by considerations connected with themselves. . . . Even if the measure should injure the interests of the clergy*, they would secure to themselves that which to them was far more valuable than that they would lose, namely, the unabated and increased respect of the people."

In our opinion any measure which would affect the independence of the clergy would not secure for them "the increased respect of the people." We are, therefore, obliged to dissent from the right reverend prelate, who, we believe, was not in any way *authorized* by the parochial clergy of England to declare that they are quite willing to submit to the sacrifice of one-fourth of their incomes. Besides, his reply seems to reduce itself to this: "How could noble lords ask the bishops to protect the incomes of the parochial clergy, when they themselves had entirely rejected the notion of being influenced by personal considerations for the interests of the landlords?" That is to say, because the Protectionists generously set aside *their own* interests, the bishops might set aside the interests of *the clergy!* No one pretended that the measure would affect the interests of *the bishops:* this point was subsequently brought out with his usual force and point by Lord Stanley.

"The right reverend prelate said that he thought no reference ought to be made to the right reverend bench on the subject of the revenues of the Church. Now, my Lords, I say that . . . the lowering of the incomes of the parochial clergy is not a private, but a public injury, and is not to be considered merely as a diminution affecting the parochial clergy alone. If the commutation tithe bill had not taken place, the clergy would have been infinitely greater sufferers by the introduction of this measure. . . . I am quite sure that the right reverend bench is above the danger of being unduly influenced. *Yet I may mention that there is a broad distinction between the parochial clergy and the members of that bench, who are the guardians of the Church. The parochial clergy are dependent for their incomes upon the price of corn, but the right reverend bench have all a fixed salary. The parochial clergy's income depends upon the fluctuating price of corn, whilst the right reverend prelates received a fixed and definite sum of money.* I am quite sure that that circumstance will not in any way actuate the right reverend bench in giving their votes upon this question, and I only mention it for the purpose of showing that a difference does exist."

These observations comprise matter which cannot fail to make a profound impression on the minds of the parochial clergy.

We believe that exceptions have been taken to the alleged fact of the nature of the Episcopal income. But on the other side it might be said, that incomes of 5000*l.* per annum *might* bear some reduction without distressing their owners, while the same could not be said of incomes of 100*l.*, 200*l.*, or 300*l.*

We now turn to the report of the speech of another right reverend prelate, alluded to in the above extract from Lord Stanley's speech.

"An appeal had been made to the right reverend bench upon which he sat—a very earnest and forcible one—on the ground that the measure would diminish the incomes of the clergy. . . He confessed that he could not welcome such an appeal as that of the noble lord's. It would be in the recollection of their lordships that one noble earl had allowed himself to use such language as the following. That noble earl begun with a most erroneous assumption of a fact respecting the incomes of the English bishops. He then called upon the right reverend bench to remember their interests. He said they were separate from the interests of the parochial clergy, possessing real property, and upon whom the measure of the government would press with peculiar severity. There could be no doubt, the noble earl said, *but it would lower their incomes, but it would benefit the bishops, because it would make money cheaper.* The noble earl, having laid down this position, called upon the bench, of which he (the Bishop of Oxford) was one, not to give a selfish vote. *He thought such an appeal would not be responded to in the spirit in which it was made.* He would say more—THE BISHOPS DID NOT REPRESENT ANY PARTICULAR CLASS—IT WAS UNCONSTITUTIONAL TO SAY SO. Such a doctrine, if admitted, would destroy the very constitution of the House of Lords. The bishops sat there to represent the interests of this great country. If they did not, their mouths must be sealed up on all but clerical matters. They were to consult not merely what was best for the clergy, but what was best for the community at large. *He would not be understood to sacrifice the interests of the clergy;* on the contrary, *he thought he was best advancing them when he promoted the public weal.*"

We may be allowed to remark on the doctrine of this right rev. prelate, that if it be true, the reason usually advanced for maintaining the seats of the hierarchy in the House of Lords is at an end. If they do not sit there to represent the interest of the Church generally; if they sit merely as legislators who are to look simply to the general interests of the country at large, and with no especial reference to those of the clergy; then we opine, that there can be no very strong reason for calling the ministers of religion away from their more appropriate and peculiar functions, and burdening them with attendance on the House of Lords.

Let us not be misunderstood in saying this. We should regret

to see the bishops expelled from the House of Lords; in the first place, because we think that their presence there is useful *for the purpose of watching all measures affecting the interests of the Church and of Religion generally;* and secondly, because their expulsion would be an important change, which ought not to be introduced without proved necessity. But we do not, we must confess, attach great weight to the mere temporal dignity and position which this privilege confers on the heads of the Church. This dignity has its disadvantages as well as its advantages: it *adds largely to the expenses of the prelacy*, and detains them from residence and cure of souls in their dioceses—duties which are as strictly incumbent on them in a religious point of view, as on the very poorest curate in the land. Our opinions on the whole question are nearly these: we should feel disinclined on some accounts to vote for the introduction of the hierarchy into the House of Lords, *if they had never been there before:* but as they have occupied seats in the legislature for a thousand years, we should think it would be dangerous now to remove them. We fear that we cannot take very high ground in maintaining this privilege, or speak very positively on the subject.

But we certainly do feel *this* most strongly: that the question of seats in Parliament is one of very subordinate importance, in comparison with the increase of the Episcopate: that the one relates to the temporalities of the Church, and the other to its spiritualities—that the one relates to its influence in the Legislature—the other to its efficiency as a means of promoting the kingdom of Jesus Christ on earth. We should be glad to see the Church ready to sacrifice all temporal considerations to those which are purely spiritual. We should be glad to see her willing, *if need be*, to lay down her temporal dignities, so that her essential ends were accomplished. We should be glad to see her in a spirit of faith, willing to risk *all* for the sake of Jesus Christ. And we feel confident, that if she could thus, courageously, faithfully, and in a spirit of self-denial, throw herself on the Divine protection—if she could get above the poor anxieties for the favour of princes, and the possession of temporal privileges, by which she is sometimes checked and restrained in the path of simple duty—she would be, even in *this world*, most amply rewarded. Is she not dependent on public opinion? Does not her strength lie in the affections of the people (humanly speaking)? What then would be so likely to strengthen her position, as to let the people of this country see, that while she does not recklessly throw away the privileges and rights with which the prudence and piety of former ages have invested her, she is still resolved to look simply and stedfastly, in the first place, to the fulfilment of her spiritual duties? That men of this world may fear to create Bishops with-

out seats in Parliament, lest, by some chance, the parliamentary privileges of the hierarchy might be endangered—that statesmen may, in this question, put aside the demands of *religion itself*, and forget the *higher interests* of the Church, we can well understand. But if it be so, it is, in our opinion, the imperative duty of the Church to set them right, and to tell them with one united voice, that "the kingdom of God and His righteousness" must *first* be sought—that no religious cause can long prosper or succeed in which this principle is not the primary motive of action.

Holding these opinions, it is with the greatest gratification that we have read what purports to be a report of speeches recently delivered in the House of Lords, on occasion of the presentation of a petition by Earl Fitzwilliam. We hail, with the utmost satisfaction, such sentiments as those which are comprised in the speeches of Earl Fitzwilliam and Lord Brougham, furnishing, as they do, the most striking evidences of the progress which the question of an increase in the hierarchy is making in the public mind. The remarks of the Bishop of Exeter, who is a proved friend of this cause, are also most valuable; and the whole conversation is doubly important, not merely from its distinct attestation to the necessity of an increase in the episcopate, but from pointing out the *source* from which that increase is to be provided for.

"Earl Fitzwilliam presented a petition from a clergyman in Oxfordshire, praying for a new division of the episcopal sees in England, that the bishops might be relieved from their onerous duty of attendance in Parliament, and that the incomes of the bishops, which the petitioner stated were dangerously large for men of God, might be reduced from £163,000 per annum, their present amount, to £80,000 per annum. He (Earl Fitzwilliam) was of opinion that the number of bishops in England ought to be largely increased, and therefore he had always objected to the union of the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph.

"The Bishop of Exeter said, that he thought it absolutely necessary to state, that the crying want from paucity of bishops in this country was an evil which must soon be remedied. He, however, did not wish to see any increase in the general episcopal income, which he thought was quite sufficient to maintain a much larger number of bishops than the present number. He believed it would be a great misfortune to the State, as well as to the Church, if the bishops, the representatives of our National Church, were excluded from Parliament. He should only add, that he hoped the noble earl would introduce some measure for the purpose of increasing the number of bishops.

"Lord Brougham said, that in his opinion the great increase in the population rendered a larger number of bishops necessary. He did not believe that the right reverend bench was overpaid, as matters now stood.

"Earl Fitzwilliam said, that he thought the bishops ought to be increased to forty in number; and he was convinced that the new ones could easily be paid out of the present episcopal revenues."

The advocates of an increase in the episcopate have rarely ventured to make any allusion to the possibility of obtaining funds for the purpose from the existing episcopal revenues. There can, however, now be no longer any difficulty or delicacy in speaking on the point. The scale of income adopted for the colonial dioceses, which has descended gradually from 4000*l.* per annum to 1200*l.*, (the incomes of the dioceses being subdivided as new dioceses were formed,) furnishes a precedent, which it might not be possible indeed strictly to follow; but which certainly cannot be overlooked or set aside. The duties of a colonial bishop are more onerous than those of an English bishop—the expenses of his visitations must be greater—the demands on his purse in new settlements, where churches and clergy are to be provided, scarcely less. And yet the average of income in England is 6000*l.* per annum, while in the colonies 1200*l.* is considered sufficient. Under these circumstances we cannot help expressing our concurrence in the views of the Bishop of Exeter and Lord Fitzwilliam. There seem to be sufficient means for doubling the number of sees, without trespassing on the funds of the State, or on private liberality. We may be permitted to add, that considering the immense increase in the population of this country, and the onerous nature of these episcopal duties which are strictly ecclesiastical and spiritual, it is not easy to see how the *additional* engagements of the hierarchy as members of the temporal legislature can be defended, unless there be a *large increase* in the episcopate.

We revert to the "Religious Opinions Relief Bill." We have shown that it would lead by necessary consequence to the exclusion of the bishops from the House of Lords.

But this is only an instalment of what would follow. The next question that would be asked is, How can the large incomes of the hierarchy be defended consistently with the principles of religious equality? Ought not the Roman Catholic hierarchy to be equally well endowed? Or else, ought not the incomes of the Protestant bishops to be divided with their rivals? if this be not admitted, then ought not the two Sects to be placed on a level, by leaving the heads of both to depend equally on the voluntary support of their respective communions? Questions like this will be pressed home, as soon as the *principle* of religious equality shall have been admitted.

Again, the application of tithes, and Church property generally, to the exclusive support of the ministers of one religious denomination, will be next pointed out as a violation of the principle of religious equality. It will be demanded that all sects shall alike support their own ministers. The contest will be to procure the confiscation of tithes and Church property; but it

may be, that some "liberal" minister, anxious to propitiate the agriculturists, may offer them the abolition of this burden on land, and the transfer of the payment of the existing clergy to the Revenue. The change would scarcely be greater and more startling than that effected by the Corn-law Bill. In this case the process of equalizing the position of all religious sects would be a very simple one. Parliament would only have to refuse the supplies, and the clergy would be at once obliged to depend on the voluntary contributions of their flocks.

But we have not yet come to the end of what might be expected. The churches would still be held by the legitimate clergy. But this would be regarded as a sign of inequality, and a grievance. It would be urged by Romanists, that their ancestors built these churches, and that they have as good a right to employ them as Protestants. It would be represented as a grievance that they were excluded from the churches which had been built by the Sovereigns of England, or from the public funds. We do not pretend to say that such claims would have any weight, if made at the present moment. They would undoubtedly now be considered as extravagant and ridiculous. But, would they be so, if the preceding steps in the course of events which we have been pointing out had been taken? Certainly not. The same spirit of Liberalism which had already gone so far, would not hesitate, for a moment, in granting to Romanists the further concession of celebrating their rites in our churches, alternately with those of the Church of England. Thus, at length, we should have arrived, by a very regular gradation, at the object which Romanists even now look to as certain to be attained:—*the celebration of Mass in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey!*

Nor is this the last step: religious liberty would be claimed for the occupant of the Throne of England; and we might thus, in process of time, have *a Romish Sovereign on the Throne, and be again governed indirectly by the Jesuits.*

We shall probably be considered by some of our readers as mere alarmists; and it will be answered, that such events as we have alluded to as within the compass of possibility, *cannot* occur. We should be most happy to be able to concur in this opinion. We have striven to hope for the Church almost against hope. We have cherished hope for her, when many around us have despaired. We have felt an undoubting confidence in the loyalty of vast multitudes of her adherents, which has been tested and proved on many occasions within our recollection. But the present aspect of affairs, both political and religious, does seem most threatening to the interests of the Church *as a National Establishment.* And this has occurred in the space

of little more than a year. At the meeting of Parliament in 1845, the Church of England stood apparently in a stronger position externally than she had done for many years. A party which had taken its stand on the principle of protection to *all Established Interests and Institutions*, had, after a glorious struggle, gained the ascendancy, and had elevated its leaders to the Ministry. What is now the state of things? In the space of one year, the ministers, thus elevated to power on the principle of protection and conservatism, have by a series of measures subversive of the interests which they were commissioned and pledged to defend,—in the face of the amplest warning, and *avowedly*, with the full knowledge of the risk which was run—utterly and finally divided the great and noble party, which had so long adhered to them with unparalleled fidelity, union, and confidence. They have outraged the principles and feelings of the friends of religion. They have exasperated to the last degree the agricultural body, on whom their power was dependent. And they will be compelled, with disgrace, to relinquish the government to those who represent interests *hostile to the Church*. Whether the constitutional party will be now able to struggle successfully with the tide of revolution which is fast setting in, is more than human wisdom can foresee. They ought at least to have the sympathies and support of every one who wishes to preserve the relics of the English constitution. We are persuaded that they will contend to the last for that sacred cause; and we can only hope that they will not visit on the Church of their Fathers, the temporary defection of some of her leaders in an hour of trial and difficulty. We trust that they will ere long receive the full support of the Church in their efforts: and if the same principles which have always hitherto guided them in their consistent course shall still continue to mark their progress, and to sustain their efforts;—if they will take their stand on *the principle of Church and State;* the preservation of all interests (and of the Church as the first and highest of all); together with the reformation of all proved abuses; they will infallibly have in the end the support of the whole Church, and of the majority of the people of England. With them, under Divine Providence, now rests whatever of hope still remains for the ultimate preservation of this country. If they cannot direct its affairs, they may at least be enabled to contend *pro aris et focis* against the antagonists of both: they may be able to frustrate their machinations and confound their measures. This is a noble destiny, if they are called to no higher; and they will finally rally around them in its fulfilment the property, the integrity, and the religion of the country.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS,

ETC.

---

1. Kay on Education in England and France. 2. Dr. Maitland on the Catacombs. 3. Wordsworth's Christian Boyhood. 4. Kennaway's Poems. 5. Waylen's Ecclesiastical Reminiscences. 6. Sharpe's History of Egypt. 7. Wilson's British India. 8. Strauss's Life of Jesus. 9. Landor's Works. 10. Dr. O'Sullivan on Development. 11. Dudley's Naology. 12. Spalding Club Publications. 13. Maurice's Lectures on the Epistle to the Hebrews. 14. Williams's Sermons at Jerusalem. 15. Taylor's Modern British Plutarch. 16. Verses for Holy Seasons. 17. Ephesus, by Rev. P. Pounden. 18. Bishop Heber, by Chambers. 19. Bishop Mant's Religio Quotidiana. 20. Bohn's Standard Library. 21. Montgomery on the Scottish Schism. 22. Miscellaneous.

1.—*The Education of the Poor in England and France. By* Joseph Kay, *B. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge.* London: Hatchards.

The publication of this volume was immediately followed by some rather severe remarks by the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, which, we think, were not calculated to create any unfavourable impression in regard to the author, or his work. Mr. Kay, who is a brother of Mr. Kay Shuttleworth, is an enthusiast in the cause of education, and argues earnestly for the necessity of the adoption of some national system of education by the State. He suggests (p. xviii.) one which shall secure "the direction of religious teaching to the clergy of the different sects, and the direction of secular teaching to the government, providing separate Normal schools for the training of schoolmasters for the Church and for the Dissenters." This is the principle of the Irish system of national education; and as experiments are always tried first in Ireland, and the Irish system has been sustained steadily by successive governments for about fifteen years, there can be very little doubt that an attempt will be made to introduce it into England, as soon as a breathing time from more important questions is allowed. Mr. Kay furnishes many interesting details on the state of primary education on the

Continent, dwelling particularly on the provision for periodical inspection and examination of the schools, the nature of the Normal schools, and the instruction imparted in them, the institution of the *Frères Chrétiens*, and their useful labours; and after drawing a contrast between the means of education provided in England and those provided in the continental countries, and taking a survey of the efforts which have been made by voluntary exertions to supply the wants of the country, he arrives at the conclusion, that it is absolutely necessary for the State to take up the question in a way proportioned to its magnitude. He calculates that the number of Normal schools requisite for England is not less than seventy-two, while there are only five in existence; that to provide for the payment of good masters for the existing schools, the Church would require 500,000*l.* per annum, which she cannot raise; that it would require 2,000,000*l.* to support a general and efficient system of national education; that this sum might be provided by suppressing out-door relief to the poor. This however should, he thinks, only be done in a gradual manner. Mr. Kay takes a gloomy view of the moral and religious condition of the people of England, more especially in the manufacturing districts, and pleads for the general spread of a religious education, under the management of the clergy and the dissenting ministers. There is one obstacle which appears to us to render all these plans perfectly Utopian. Who would believe for a moment, that the English Parliament, which has been in the habit of expending some 30,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* per annum on education, and which last year made a prodigious exertion, and actually expended 75,000*l.*, would listen to any proposal for a permanent charge of 2,500,000*l.*? We should like to see any member of Parliament making such a proposal. This is not the way in which we do things in England. We do not compute the wants of the country, and then attempt to provide for them. But we give as much as we conveniently can, without inquiry. This is an economical method. By pursuing it we acquire the character of liberality at a cheap rate. Our plans for Church extension are guided by this economical principle. No one attempts to procure any estimate of the *actual wants* of the Church; but a sum is applied to meet them (certainly large in its actual amount); and as some good is of course done, we assume that the want of Church extension has been tolerably provided for. On the whole, though we cannot concur with many of Mr. Kay's views, we have derived interest and instruction from his work. Most earnestly do we wish that such publications might act as a warning to the Church of what is probably coming, and might induce her in

the mean time to make increased exertions in the cause of education on sound principles.

II.—*The Church of the Catacombs: a Description of the Primitive Church of Rome, illustrated by its Sepulchral Remains. By* Charles Maitland, *M.D.* London: Longmans.

The volume before us supplies a desideratum in our literature which has long been felt. The works of Arringhi, Fabretti, Boldetti, Bottari, and others who have laboured in the interesting field of inquiry presented by the subterranean antiquities of Rome, are not within the reach of the English reader. On the other hand, Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Rock have attempted to enlist these relics of antiquity in the service of Romanism, and from the absence of information on a branch of knowledge which has been much cultivated in Italy, some persons have been perplexed by the plausible references which have been made to alleged inscriptions and representations, which are assumed to be of the very earliest date, and to include a recognition of Romish doctrines and practices. The doctrine of development has, indeed, materially weakened the force of this argument, because it demonstrates that the peculiarities of Romanism were not received by the Church from the beginning, but gradually reasoned out. Still, it is both important and interesting to be allowed such an insight as the work before us affords, into the nature of the sepulchral remains of Rome. The extensive catacombs, which extend under a considerable part of Rome, and which spread in one direction to a distance of fifteen miles, were originally excavated as quarries and sand pits, but they gradually were made receptacles for the dead, and in the course of ages the number of tombs, and of sculptures, paintings, and inscriptions accumulated there, was enormous. The catacombs became a place of sepulture about the end of the Roman Republic, and they continued to be so for many centuries after the Christian æra. During the heathen persecutions they were the refuge of the Christians, who here remained in concealment, celebrating their religious rites by stealth, and depending for their daily sustenance on those of the brethren, whose humble station permitted them with safety to remain above ground. The bishops of Rome were generally buried here for several centuries, and the remains of the martyrs were also deposited here. The chapels in which the persecuted believers worshipped the true God are still in existence amongst these catacombs; but the inscriptions and other remains of art have been generally transferred to the various museums of Rome, and more especially to that of the Vatican. In these

invaluable collections the author of the work before us has bestowed his time most judiciously, and in a way to interest and instruct his readers. The interesting work of Mrs. Hamilton Gray, on the sepulchres of Etruria, with which our readers are doubtless well acquainted, is an evidence of the interest with which what seems to be a merely antiquarian topic, may be invested by the light in which it is placed by an author. We must select some illustrations of the mode in which the subject before us is treated:—

"The fact that the catacombs were employed as a refuge from persecution, rests upon good evidence, notwithstanding objections that have been made, founded upon the narrowness of the passages, the difficulty of supporting life, and the risk of discovery, increased by seeking concealment in an asylum so well known to their enemies. These objections scarcely apply to a temporary residence below ground in times of danger, and it is not pretended that the catacombs were inhabited under other circumstances . . . . The catacombs have become illustrious by the actual martyrdom of some noble witnesses to the truth. Xystus, bishop of Rome, together with Quartus, one of his clergy, suffered below ground in the time of Cyprian."—pp. 27, 28.

The inscriptions on the tombs of the ancient Christians are in many cases most deeply interesting: we take one or two as specimens. The following is of the date of the fifth persecution, A.D. 161.

"In Christ. Alexander is not dead, but lives beyond the stars, and his body rests in this tomb. He lived under the Emperor Antonine, who, perceiving that great benefit would result from his services, returned evil for good: for while on his knees, and about to sacrifice to the true God, he was led away to execution. O, such times! in which sacred rites and prayers, even in caverns, afford no protection to us. What can be more wretched than such a life? and what than such a death? when they could not be buried by their friends and relations—At length they sparkle in heaven. He has scarcely lived, who has lived in Christian times."

There is a great mass of most curious information on ancient rites and customs in this volume. In particular, the various signs and tokens by which Romish antiquaries pretend to discover the relics of martyrs in these cemeteries, are very carefully discussed, and their uncertainty is demonstrated. We select the following interesting remarks:—

"The romance of the eleven thousand virgins is said to owe its existence to the inscription,

VRSVLA. ET. XI. MM. VV.

which was read 'Ursula and eleven thousand virgins,' instead of 'Eleven virgin martyrs.'

"The history of St. Veronica exceeds all other legends of pseudo-saints, in the pertinacity with which it has been supported by the Roman Church, in opposition to the learned of her own communion, and in the entire absence of traditional evidence. Its origin and progress have been brought to light by the researches of Romanist antiquarians.

"About the darkest time of the middle ages, arose the custom of painting the countenance of our Saviour upon pieces of cloth: the accuracy of the supposed likeness, or *icon*, as it was called, was attested by inscribing beneath it the words 'vera icon,' gradually corrupted into Veronica. Many writers mention there *veronicæ;* as is observed by Mabillon, who has cited passages from Romanus, Petrus Casinensis, and Augustinus Patricius. Mabillon also mentions the petition of a certain Cistercian abbess, dated 1249, to Jacobus de Trecis, the pope's chaplain, that he would send her a copy of the picture contained in St. Peter's. He complied with her request, and begged her to receive the copy as 'a holy Veronica, Christ's true image and likeness.' The next stage in the growth of the legend (for it does not seem to be of older date), was the discovery that the original Veronica was an actual impression of our Saviour's features, miraculously taken at some time or other: according to Mabillon, during the agony in the garden; to Ducange, on the way to Calvary; and by another class of persons, as noticed by Baronius, supposed to have been left upon the head-dress in the sepulchre. But the story still wanted something, and Veronica was at length found to be the name of a holy woman who followed our Lord to Calvary; and who, while piously wiping the Redeemer's brow with a cloth, received as a reward the miraculous impression of his countenance. Of this woman, whom Baronius calls Berenice, *there is a colossal statue in St. Peter's, at Rome;* and what is worse, her image occupies a prominent place in the hearts of our ignorant people. . . . The handkerchief of St. Veronica is publicly worshipped in Rome on stated occasions, and the ceremony is performed with the utmost splendour: perhaps there is no part of the Romish ritual more calculated to strike the imagination. The prostrate multitude, the dome of St. Peter's, dimly lighted by the torches in the nave, and the shadowy baldacchino, hanging to all appearance in mid-air, form a spectacle not easily forgotten."

There is much interesting discussion in this volume on the supposed signs of martyrdom on the tombs of the ancient Christians. This is a question of very great practical importance at Rome, inasmuch as the catacombs have furnished a large number of *relics*, the sanctity of which is tested in some degree by certain signs which antiquarians have chosen to regard as indicative of the martyrdom of their former inhabitants. Various implements are found in these tombs, which are considered to be instruments of torture: some of these appear to have been forged in modern times; in reference to others, Dr. Maitland remarks with justice,

that "these objects, if merely an imitation of the instruments of torture, are of no value as actual relics of the martyrs: and if it is pretended that they were really employed in the execution of those with whose bodies they were interred, we may answer, that it is incredible that the Christians should have obtained from the Pagan authorities their instruments of punishment, in order to add to the honours of the martyrs' funeral." It seems, in fact, that these pretended instruments of torture, were nothing more nor less than the *tools* which the deceased had employed in their various trades and callings. It has been supposed that "a figure praying," represented on a tomb, was a symbol of martyrdom; but Dr. Maitland remarks that this sign occurs on tombs of the fourth and fifth centuries—*after* the ages of martyrdom. Again, the Congregation of relics, in 1668, determined that a palm sculptured on a tomb, and a vessel tinged with blood, are most certain signs of martyrdom. The vessels here alluded to are vases of terra-cotta, glass, alabaster, or ivory, found in the Christian tombs, which have been considered as receptacles of the martyrs' blood. But it appears that the "palm branch" is now almost universally abandoned, and "the vessel of blood," though still generally received on the Continent as an emblem of martyrdom, is already attacked in various quarters as being of uncertain meaning. Of the latter emblem, no trace is found in contemporary writings—the blood sometimes collected at the time of the execution seems to have been preserved as a relic, not to have been buried: and "the great number of cups discovered, some of which are drinking vessels, with inscriptions and figures of a date long posterior to that of the persecutions, leaves room to doubt their having been employed with any uniform intention." Dr. Maitland, after quoting the various opinions of antiquaries on this point, arrives at a very sensible conclusion—"Between the heathen lachrymatory and the so-called martyr-vase there exists no well-defined difference; and not knowing the exact intention of the vessel in either case, beyond the probability that it was a depository for aromatic gums, we may suppose the Christians to have borrowed it from the Pagans, with such modification of its use as time and circumstances suggested."

On the whole, it appears that the supposed symbols of martyrdom lie under most serious objections. "Excepting a very few cases, where the deceased is expressly described as a martyr, that circumstance seems to have been left unrecorded in the cemetery."

The catacombs contain some inscriptions on clergy who were buried there. The following is on one of the Roman presbyters:—

" LOCVS BASILI PRESB. ET FELICITATI EIVS
" SIBI FECERVNT."

" To Basilus the presbyter, and Felicitas his wife. They made this for themselves."

Aringhi has preserved an inscription, of which the following is a translation:—

" Petronia, a priest's wife, the type of modesty. In this place I lay my bones; spare your tears, dear husband and daughters, and believe that it is forbidden to weep for one who lives in God. Buried in peace, on the third nones of October, in the Consulate of Festus [*i. e.* in 472]."

Dr. Maitland remarks, that very few epitaphs of persons devoted to celibacy are found in the Lapidarian Gallery at the Vatican. The inscriptions, too, seem in general not to contain prayers for the dead; and the invocations of saints do not appear. Sculptured representations of scenes and events mentioned in Holy Scripture are not unfrequent; such as the Three Children in the Fiery Furnace, and the History of Daniel. The Good Shepherd carrying a Lamb thrown across his shoulders is a well-known emblem of our Lord. This emblem occurs frequently on the sepulchres of the early Christians, but the representation is derived with little variation from heathenism. " In the tomb of the Nasones," says Dr. Maitland, " a heathen family of eminence in Rome, may be seen, among many mythological paintings, the figure of a shepherd with a sheep on his shoulders, and a crook in his hand, surrounded by the Four Seasons. What was intended by this heathen painting is not clear; but by a slight alteration, the same composition was soon converted into a 'bonus pastor' by Christian artists. The change however was slow: the Pan's pipe remained for some time in the hand of the chief shepherd, and the Roman dress was seldom abandoned." There are many representations of the events of our Lord's life in these sepulchres—such as the raising of Lazarus, the multiplication of the loaves and fishes, the restoration of sight to the blind, and the cure of the paralytic. It is a very curious fact, that " in all the pictures and sculptures of our Lord's history, no reference is ever found to his sufferings or death."

On the whole, we are bound to say that Dr. Maitland has produced a most interesting and valuable book, replete with information which is in a great degree new to the English reader. It is copiously illustrated by wood-cuts from drawings by the author.

III. *Christian Boyhood at a Public School. A Collection of Sermons and Lectures delivered at Winchester College. By the Rev.* CHARLES WORDSWORTH, *M.A., late Second Master.* 2 vols. London: Rivingtons. 1846.

IT has long been the reproach of our public schools, and we fear not without reason, that religious culture has been excluded from their system—that they have offered, not facilities, but discouragements, for the formation of the Christian character. It was to be expected, of course, that a boy would be exposed to greater difficulties and temptations upon going to school, than he could have experienced at home. Where boys are congregated in large masses, there *must* be a considerable amount of moral evil. But the fault has been, that little or no pains have been taken in our larger schools to counteract and mitigate the evil which was unavoidable; it has been regarded too much as a thing for which there was no remedy. Suggestions for a higher and more Christian mode of dealing with it have been immediately put aside as impracticable. Complaints have been put to silence by the formidable truism, that "boys will be boys." The idea of "Christian boyhood" has been well nigh lost among us. Our public schools have produced scholars and gentlemen; but they cannot be said to have tended, by the system pursued by them in later times, to train the "babe in Christ" to the perfection of his spiritual manhood.

We should be very sorry to imply that men of high Christian principle, nay of the highest eminence in this respect, have seldom issued from public schools. A host of living examples, as well as many of a former generation, would instantly occur to the mind, and forbid such an allegation; but we greatly doubt whether any of these have owed ought of their Christian integrity and stedfastness to the training of their schoolboy days. It has been rather in spite of the influences by which, in that period of their life, they were surrounded, than by the aid of them, that their religious principles were maintained and strengthened.

There are now, however, many cheering indications that a better state of things is beginning to arise: Dr. Arnold, it must be gratefully acknowledged, set an example of improvement, which, we trust, is being extensively followed. And we are happy to think that the great defect of his teaching, useful as it undoubtedly was, in important respects, to his pupils, is not chargeable upon those who are now aiming, under God, to Christianize "the most principal" of the schools of the country. The volumes before us are published by their excellent author as a legacy of

love to the boys of Winchester college, his impaired health having compelled him to retire from the office of second master, which he held for ten years. Although, however, they are "especially designed," as Mr. W. informs us, for Wykehamists; and, naturally, abound in references, and treat of details which none but Wykehamists can understand; they furnish us with a most valuable body of Christian teaching, from which all who are engaged in education, of boys particularly, may gather lessons eminently wise and profitable. It is evident from these discourses, that Mr. Wordsworth never lost sight, in discharging the duties of his office, of his own special obligations as a minister of Christ's Church, or of the responsibilities of his pupils, as being, by holy baptism, members of the same. He deals with them as with "new creatures in Christ Jesus," and labours to awaken in them a worthy sense of their spiritual capacities, privileges, and obligations. But the great excellence of his teaching consists, we think, in his happy application of Church or Gospel principles to the various ordinary and (so to call them) trifling occasions of a schoolboy's every-day life. This, we suppose, is felt to be their greatest difficulty by those who are attempting to carry out a Christian education; and to all such these results of Mr. Wordsworth's experience and judgment must prove an invaluable help. As an instance of the practical character of these addresses, we give the following extract from the sermon on "The Practice of Private Prayer." It appears that the boys had been shamed out of the performance of this necessary Christian duty—and Mr. W. appeals to the prefects, to use their authority to break through this disgraceful custom—

"It is never my desire," he says, "or intention, to recommend what I cannot fairly expect you to perform; still less to press upon your obedience any command which I myself believe to be impracticable. And as regards the practice of private prayer, in the present state of things, I am ready to confess that (much as I might wish it) I dare not hope to be able to persuade the generality—perhaps not one individual—of you to kneel down singly by his bedside, and say his prayers. All I can now hope is, that many of you are in the habit of praying secretly as you lie down in your beds; and though I consider this as unsatisfactory, if not insufficient, on many accounts, still any method of prayer, provided it be regularly and devoutly performed will prove, I doubt not, an acceptable service in the sight of God, &c.

"What I *do* wish then is, to put it to you as prefects, *whether the present state of things in this respect might not be improved?* I wish you to consider, whether by some simple regulations among yourselves, the practice of this unquestionable duty, which is now

so full of difficulty and temptation, might not be rendered easy and delightful."

Soon afterwards follows the proposal:—

"Say your own prayers *openly*, and at a *stated time*, *on your knees*, and require those who are committed to your charge to do the same. Let the 'Prefect in course' in each chamber preserve the same quiet and order before you retire to rest for the short space of five or ten minutes of *prayer time*, as he is accustomed to do during the longer period of 'Toy time.'"

It is interesting to learn that this good counsel was adopted, and that it proved successful, by the Divine blessing, in banishing the reproach to which it referred.

We take the following from the discourse, entitled "On the duty of young Communicants in details of School Discipline:"—

"Certain it is, we teach you again and again, that the very test and touchstone of your sincerity, of the strength of your characters, and of your religious earnestness, lies in matters of this kind (the point under immediate notice is that of keeping within bounds), that the exact, punctual, regular performance of the ordinary duties of your *daily life*, is the best and only sure method, not only to win the favour of man, but to approve yourselves in the sight of Almighty God: that however these may be *little things in themselves*, yet so long as they are *positively commanded* by those whom you are bound to obey, to you they are not such: and even if they were, that *it is in little things that the real hearty desire of doing one's duty will best be shown;* and again, that it is not whether the transgression be little or great, but whether you are *acting on the principle of obedience*, *or of disobedience*, which it concerns you to consider; for 'He that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much.'"

On the duty of reverent behaviour in public worship, Mr. W. has these impressive words:—

"You will do very wrong if you suffer yourselves to regard this matter as one between yourselves as schoolboys and a master whom personally you may or may not choose to respect. It is not as a master, but as a minister of Christ, that I speak to you on these things; neither is it as schoolboys, but as members of Christ's body, and as God's children, that you are admitted here. I desire, indeed, as far as in me lies, to point out to you what is right; but having done this, however much I may wish and pray for your own sakes, that you may be led to practise it, both in this and every other case, Christian discretion, no less than Christian reverence in holy things, forbids that I do seek to compass, by the exercise of any lower authority that which the authority of the Church and of Christ's ministers is insufficient to effect. Only let me leave you with these reflections:—If we cannot, *will not*, drive out sin and disobedience from the immediate presence of God in his house and worship, how shall we hope to over-

come them and expel them elsewhere? . . . . Above all, consider this. *Twice*, at the least, in every day, accordingly as you shall follow or neglect these directions, you will either be practising yourself in a habit of wilful, deliberate disobedience, (and that, too, while professing to be engaged in God's service,) a practice which cannot fail to be productive of the most fatal consequences upon your future course, or you will be forming a habit of holy, dutiful obedience, which is no less certain to call down upon you God's blessing, and to clear and smooth the path which is before you."—Vol. i. p. 233.

These samples, taken at random from the work before us, may help perhaps to give those who are not yet acquainted with it, some notion, though a most imperfect one, of its great value. We heartily and entirely recommend it to all who are engaged or interested in the important work of education.

IV.—*Poems. By the Rev.* C. E. KENNAWAY, *M.A.* London: Rivingtons.

THE pieces comprised in this volume are classed by the author under the following heads—"Religious Subjects"—"Home Subjects"—those which are "of a general character"—"Sonnets"—"Epitaphs." It will thus be seen that there is very considerable variety in the contents, and that the author has attempted most of the styles of poetic composition. We can, perhaps, best express our sense of the merit of these compositions, by expressing a wish that the author could be permitted by his sacred avocations to undertake and complete some longer poems than any which are included in the present publication. There is that in the character of his poetry which reminds us forcibly of Cowper, and occasionally of Wordsworth. There is something of the affection and simplicity of the one, with the high philosophy of the other. It is not for us to determine the rank and position which the author of these poems is to hold amongst English poets, but we can say with sincerity, that we have perused his volume with no ordinary gratification and interest. The poems on "the affections" seem to us those in which the author appears to most advantage. Take the following specimen "On seeing in a book, J. K—, jun., chiefly on my Father's Death:"—

> "Why from my bosom rose that pensive sigh,
> As on that name I gazed? A brother's name,
> Dear from my cradle, dear from childhood—loved
> With warmer love as each maturer grew,
> And summer ripened all the hopes of spring.

A brother's name! but oh! how strange a tale
One little word declares of changed existence!
Age has gone down, and youth hath ceased to be—
For who can keep the character of a son,
When he that was his honour'd father dies.
* * * * *
The flowers have all come out since he went hence;
The forest has been green and gay: the birds
Have sung their love-songs; piping to the morn,
The lark has scal'd his cloudy stairs, and all
The summer tribes have had their summer joys:
But cold the while thine honoured head was laid,
My Father! Thou no more canst taste the joy
That fills the frame, when spring puts forth her power,
And comes with life o'erloaded; not for thee
Peeps the gilt crocus from its summer grave,
Or lily later loads the air with love."

The following lines are from a poem entitled, "Change of Residence," referring to an incident in the author's early life:—

"Far away,
In many a distant solitude repose
Sequestered hearts; they wake at morning prime
In happy joyance, and they lay them down
When softly on the slope the shadows fall;
Small care have they of camp or kingly court;
Encircled by their native hills they dwell,
Each his own centre; bearing each the bloom
Of social charities, as she that loved
Her own few people better than the world.

Yet e'en to these, though silent and remote,
Reaches the wondrous stream; no devious bay,
No inland creek, how much soe'er removed,
Eludes the wandering waters. Calm they live,
And calmer still 'mid weeping friends they die;
Calm is their sunny youth and green old age;
And yet the changes of mortality
Are theirs as all men's. . . .
The change e'en now commences: slowly move
The freighted waggons; bustling menials urge
Their rapid work; confusion absolute
Sits o'er the scene; while jests and laughter loud
Tell the strange sights that rummaged chests disclose.
* * * * *
Those books have slept within their narrow shelves,
Just as he left them when he laid them down,
Himself to sleep the dreamless sleep below.

Piled on that truck, alas! they tell no more
Their former tale; they're dumb for memory,
And all their pleasant tones have died away."

We should gladly dwell further on this most pleasing and interesting volume, but our space warns us to conclude. Mr. Kennaway is already advantageously known to the theological world by an excellent little work on Baptism, and by his Sermons; and the volume before us will add to his reputation.

v.—*Ecclesiastical Reminiscences of the United States. By the Rev.* Edward Waylen, *late Rector of Christchurch, Rockville, Maryland, eleven years resident in America.* London: Straker.

The author of this work in the preface states, that he "has made no effort to shape and adapt his narrative to any established model in the same department of authorship; nor is he prepared with any apology for the prominence which is given to himself." We certainly cannot say much for the execution of this work, which is rather carelessly put together, and betrays occasional inaccuracies of style. It combines the various characters of an autobiography, a book of travels, and a series of ecclesiastical sketches. We select a specimen of the author's mode of treating his subject, which will be read with interest:—

"My clerical engagements took me several times up the Delaware. One of these excursions, which lives in my memory as the most interesting in the incidents which marked it, was to Burlington, the residence of the Bishop of New Jersey. . . . It was a bright sunny day, and the ample doors of Riverside were thrown open, discovering the Bishop's family at breakfast, while enjoying the prospect spread out by Nature's most lavish hand before the house. The sober, quiet refinement, and social comfort presented by the family group, and the unambitious elegance of the mansion, imparted to the scene a character peculiarly English. Several beautiful children occupied their places at the family board, whose deportment gave evidence of their good breeding, and the happy influence of private and maternal training under the check of religious principles. After breakfast I accompanied C——n to the garden, spread round the house, where the gravelled walks, winding their serpentine course through borders of well-trimmed shrubs, and the closely shaven lawn, completed the picture, which instantly carried our thoughts homeward. The church of St. Mary fronts a street a little out of the closest part of the city. It is cruciform in its plan, but unpretending in its architectural design, and rather low. Sur-

mounting the central elevation is a stone cross, announcing to the by-passer that the building is neither a Mahommedan nor a Pagan, nor (by its appropriate symbol, the *weather vane*,) a sectarian place of worship, but a *Christian* temple, belonging to the one universal Church of the Apostles. Groups were gathered in the pleasant churchyard at the time of our arrival, and many had taken their seats in the consecrated place where the Trinity is worshipped. It was the festival of that holy mystery, and the Bishop's sermon embraced a notice of the sublime doctrine of the Three in One, which he treated practically in the evening's discourse at three o'clock. The evening's service was also celebrated at eight, p.m., in the chapel of St. Mary's hall, when the Bishop summed up the arguments, and enforced the exhortations used in his previous discourses; adding an appeal, couched in most feeling language, to his female auditors, to carry to their closets the recollection of the instructions received during the day. At the end of the chapel service the young ladies of the school, numbering about two hundred, each shook hands with the Bishop on their way to the supper-room."—pp. 424, 425.

VI.—*The History of Egypt from the Earliest Times till the Conquest by the Arabs*, A.D. 640. *By* SAMUEL SHARPE. *New Edition.* London: Moxon.

A CONSIDERABLE mass of information is accumulated in this volume, but the style is heavy and ungraceful, and we are sorry to observe that the author is very unsound in his views of Christian doctrine and Church government. From the manner in which he speaks of "Jesus of Nazareth," we should infer that Mr. Sharpe holds Socinian views. We cannot, therefore, recommend the work to our readers.

VII.—*The History of British India, from* 1805 *to* 1835. *By* HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, *M.A.*, *F.A.S. Vol. II.* London: Madden and Malcolm.

THE present volume of Professor Wilson's History of British India, in continuation of the well-known work of Mill, includes the administration of the Marquis of Hastings, and extends from 1813 to 1823. The high reputation of the author, and the authentic character of the work itself, derived as it is from original documents, combined with the most perfect knowledge of the subject, will, of course, place this history amongst that class of works which are indispensable to every well-furnished library.

VIII.—*The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined. By Dr.* DAVID FREDERICK STRAUSS. *Translated from the Fourth German Edition. In 3 Vols.* London: Chapmans.

THE appearance of this work is curious, as an indication of the present tendencies of Unitarianism in England. Unable to maintain its own cause against the advocates of Catholic truth, Unitarianism appeared for many years to have sunk into a state of torpor and inanition; but it has of late apparently been led to hope that its objects may be attained through the increasing taste for German literature. It is our apprehension that some of our own writers are indirectly tending to bring about the same result, by appealing on all occasions to the writings of modern German theologians. In the excited state of the public mind on religious subjects, and the avidity with which religious novelty is sought for, there are certainly grounds for the apprehension, that the translation of German works bearing on philosophy and theology, is likely to have some effect in further unsettling the faith of many amongst us. Unitarianism would not be listened to for a moment; but German Transcendentalism and Mysticism may obtain some hearing, because they are new to most English readers. On the other hand, it is a conclusive and final argument against Unitarianism, that it has been driven at last to make common cause with absolute blasphemy and infidelity, like that of Strauss's Life of Jesus. Such is the result of Unitarianism—the Gospel is at length asserted to be a "mythus," from beginning to end!

IX.—*The Works of* WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR. *In 2 Volumes.* London: Moxon.

To those who are admirers of the works of Mr. Walter Savage Landor, this neatly and accurately printed edition of them will be an acceptable gift. Admitting, as one is bound to do, the ability and learning of Mr. Landor's imaginary conversations, there is something unsatisfactory in a work which by such means contrives to put forth the most opposite doctrines and principles, in many cases most dangerous and objectionable, without pronouncing any decision. There is in some parts of these works a tone of levity on religious matters which is much to be regretted.

X.—*The Theory of Developments in Christian Doctrine applied and tested. By* MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN, *D.D., Rector of Killyman, &c.* London: Parker.

THE author of this able work is well known to the world as a

powerful advocate of the cause of the persecuted Church of Ireland. The volume before us is dedicated by permission to the reverend prelate who presides over that Church; and we have no doubt that it will add to the well-earned reputation of its respected author. It would be difficult to make an analysis of the contents of Dr. O'Sullivan's work, which is a reply to Mr. Newman's Essay, and follows the order of subjects in that remarkable production. We must say that in vigour of argument and learning, the work before us surpasses most of the replies to Mr. Newman which have been written at this side of the Channel.

XI.—*Naology: or a Treatise on the Origin, Progress, and Symbolical Import of the Sacred Structures of the most eminent Nations and Ages of the World. By* JOHN DUDLEY, *M.A., &c.* London: Rivingtons.

THE author of this work had intended to publish it under the auspices of the Camden Society, but subsequently disapproving of the supposed principles of that society, he now offers it to the public unpatronized, "as one of the numerous articles that almost daily issue from the machinery of the press." The work contains a great mass of materials, furnishing many evidences of research and labour; and without more than the average amount of antiquarian speculation. Mr. Dudley's Protestantism is of the most ardent kind.

XII.—*Selections from the Records of the Kirk Session, Presbytery, and Synod of Aberdeen.* Aberdeen: Printed for the Spalding Club.

THIS volume of the publications of the Spalding Club is chiefly valuable as illustrating the ecclesiastical history and discipline of Scotland. It commences with the regulations made at Aberdeen in 1562, on the introduction of the Reformation, and it brings the series of events down to the Revolution of 1688. Much curious information in reference to popular superstitions and customs now extinct is supplied in this collection.

XIII.—*The Epistle to the Hebrews; being the substance of Three Lectures, &c. With a Preface, containing a Review of Mr. Newman's Theory of Development. By* FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE, *M.A., &c.* London: Parker.

A REVIEW of Mr. Newman's essay occupies considerably more

than half of the volume before us, and thus forms, in fact, the principal subject of the work. The author proceeds regularly through Mr. Newman's essay, furnishing an analysis of each chapter, with his own remarks. Mr. Maurice thus describes what he conceives to be the essential idea of the Bible:—

"This, I think, is the principle of the Bible, the principle which goes through every part of it, that the unseen God is actually ruling over man; that all orders of men are appointed by Him, and are ruling under Him; that just so far as they know this, and live and act in the faith of it, they are doing their right work in the world, are helping to expound the laws and principles of the Divine Government, are helping to bring man into that service which is freedom. . . . . Now this statement may seem to Mr. Newman and to a great many others, a mere vague repetition of what they have heard often before; of what they have sneered at, and dismissed from their minds, as quite unsatisfactory and unmeaning. I am content that it should be so. But I am sure that this which they reject, is still the simple faith of hundreds of poor men and women in all countries of the world, Romish as well as Protestant."—pp. xxxvi. xxxvii.

We trust that this is the faith of something more than "hundreds" of poor men; and that it is not restricted to the "poor." The position which the author of this work holds, as Professor of Divinity at King's College, lends, of course, peculiar interest to his first publication after his appointment to that important office. We must confess that we cannot altogether go along with him in certain views which seem calculated to unsettle all existing theological systems, without constructing any definite and coherent system in their place.

XIV.—*Sermons preached at Jerusalem in the years* 1842 *and* 1843. *By the Rev.* GEORGE WILLIAMS, *M.A., Chaplain to the late Bishop of the Anglican Church in that City, &c.* London: Parker.

THE preface of this volume furnishes painful evidence of the difficulties in which the episcopal mission at Jerusalem was involved from its commencement.

"I will candidly avow," says Mr. Williams, "that I was very anxious, as opportunity was afforded me, to counteract, as far as possible, the effects of a certain tone of teaching which obtained at Jerusalem during my connexion with the mission, and which appeared to me both erroneous and exceedingly objectionable, as tending to the subversion of Christian liberty, and to the corruption of the purity and simplicity of the Gospel. I allude to that view which would substitute the exploded literal, for the received spiritual interpretation of the prophecies relating to the privileges and glories of the Israel of God; on

which is based a system that would in effect build up again 'the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile.' . . . Persuaded as I am of the dangerous tendency of such views (which sometimes go the length of looking for the restoration of the bloody sacrifices of the Law, and the re-establishment of the Levitical ritual), my office required me to guard against it; delicate and difficult as the duty was in my peculiar position."

As far as we have examined these Sermons, they appear to be sound, practical, and Scriptural discourses.

XV.—*The Modern British Plutarch; or, Lives of Men distinguished in the recent History of our Country. By* W. C. Taylor, *LL.D.*, &c. London: Grant and Griffith.

The volume before us will be found useful in making children acquainted with the lives and characters of the most eminent statesmen, and other distinguished personages of the last and present generation. It is written in a clear and unaffected style, and with apparent impartiality.

XVI.—*Verses for Holy Seasons; with Questions for Examination. By* C. F. H. *Edited by* Walter Farquhar Hook, *D.D.*, *Vicar of Leeds.* London: Rivingtons.

These hymns were written by a lady resident in Ireland, with a view of adopting the principle of the Christian Year to the capacities of the young and uneducated. We cannot say much for the poetical merits of these verses, but their tone is simple, and adapted to children. The following stanzas will convey some notion of the work.

"When first our Lord came down on earth,
He did not scorn like us to be,
For He was born of mortal birth,
A simple child of low degree.

"Where Syrian waves are bright and clear,
Where Judah's grapes *grow large and red,*
He walked below; and men drew near,
And heard the holy words He said."

We perfectly agree with the respected editor, that there is in the volume a little of "what may appear to some to be a kind of sing-song style of versification."

XVII.—*Ephesus; or, the Church's precedent in Doctrine and Discipline. By the Rev.* P. Pounden, *A.M.*, *Vicar of Westport, diocese of Tuam.* London: Seeleys.

The author of this work, from a comparison of the various notices

which Scripture supplies of the state of the Church at Ephesus in the time of the Apostles, deduces an argument to show that the clerical orders, government, and standing of the Church of England as a sound branch of Christ's Church Catholic, is more nearly accordant to the Apostolical model, than that of any community of dissenters in existence.

XVIII.—*Bishop Heber and Indian Missions. By the Rev.* JAMES CHAMBERS, *B.A.*, &c. London: Parker.

A PLEASING little volume, comprising a brief outline of the Church History of India, previously to the appointment of Heber to the See of Calcutta, with a Life of that eminent man, and a notice of the principal events which have occurred in reference to Christianity in India since his death. The life and character of Heber occupy too large a share of the volume in our judgment.

XIX.—*Religio Quotidiana; Daily Prayer the Law of God's Church. By the Right Rev.* RICHARD MANT, *D.D., Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore.* London: Parker.

THE right reverend author of this little volume has here collected a large mass of authorities and examples in reference to the daily celebration of Divine Service, which he strongly and earnestly recommends. Independently of the importance of such a collection, as evincing the opinions and practice of our bishops and clergy in former times, it is edifying to be brought thus in contact with the private and devotional life of so many excellent men. It is deeply to be lamented, that the frequent offering of worship to God should be considered by any one as indicating peculiar or party opinions on religious subjects.

XX.—*Bohn's Standard Library.*

THE volumes of this library which we have recently seen, are Sismondi's Literature of Europe, Schlegel's Dramatic Literature, and Roscoe's Lorenzo de Medici. The cheapness of these volumes is astonishing: we sincerely hope that the enterprising publisher may be supported by the public in this attempt to supply cheap books. But we should think that the risk must be very great.

XXI.—*A Letter on the Recent Schisms in Scotland. By the Rev.* ROBERT MONTGOMERY, *M.A.* London: Lendrum.

A SENSIBLE and well-timed publication. We have already expressed our opinion on the subject of the Scottish schism. To separate from the Communion of a Church, which has been recently recognized by the legislature of this country as in full

communion with the English Church, is, in our judgment, equivalent to a separation from the Church of England herself.

XXII.—*Miscellaneous.*

We have to notice with the highest commendation a Sermon on the "Practical Doctrine of the Incarnation," and the Hyperdulia ascribed to the Virgin Mary. By the Rev. W. B. Heathcote, B.C.L., Fellow and Tutor of New College. (Oxford: Parker.) This, for its size, is one of the most elaborate compositions we have ever seen, bearing on the worship of the Virgin. "Anglican Ordinations Valid." By the Rev. J. Fuller Russell, B.C.L. (Masters), containing some strictures on a publication by Dr. Kenrick, a Romanist, appears to be carefully and well executed. "Romanism as represented by the Rev. J. H. Newman," &c. By the Rev. H. Irvine, B.D., Vicar of St. Margaret's, Leicester (Rivingtons), contains many curious details of Romish superstitions. "Mithridates; or Mr. Newman's Essay on Development, its own Confutation; by a Quondam Disciple" (Cleaver), is not deficient in ability; but its limited extent tends to rather a superficial view of the subject. The Rev. Walter Blunt has published a very useful Tract on Confirmation (Cleaver), in which the spiritual benefits of that holy rite are considered, and questions for examination are appended. The Rev. Stafford Brown, M.A., has published a Sermon on Prayer for the Clergy, entitled, "Brethren, pray for us"—The Rev. T. C. Hadden, LL.B., a Visitation Sermon, "The Church of England's Commission to her Priests Considered"—The Rev. C. B. Dalton, M.A., Rector of Lambeth, A Farewell Sermon in Lincoln's Inn Chapel (Sharpe); all of which are deserving of notice.

"Observations on the Present State of Congregational Singing," by W. H. Plumstead (Sharpe), contains many sensible remarks, and suggestions for the improvement of congregational singing. "Church Reform and Clerical Delinquencies" (Hatchards), touches on the subjects of Clerical Education and Testimonials, the Amusements of the Clergy, and Clerical Magistrates, Pluralities, Patronage, Discipline, and Pews.

The "Transactions of the Exeter Diocesan Architectural Society, Vol. II. Part II.," furnish evidence of the zeal and ability with which the study of Architecture is pursued in the West of England. The papers in this number evince very great knowledge of the subject, and the engravings are very well executed. We are glad to see that "The Churches of Yorkshire" (Green, Leeds), is still in the course of publication. The architectural details of this work are excellent, and its letter-press possesses more than ordinary interest.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

Spread of Protestantism in France.—*Justification of the Intelligence contained in a former Number of the English Review.*—Our Foreign Intelligence of December, 1844, contains, among other articles on the State of Religion in France, an account of the "Spread of Protestantism" in several of the French dioceses. The paragraph, having been copied by the *Calcutta Christian Advocate*, a dissenting publication, without citing the authority on which the statement rested, was treated by the *Bengal Catholic Herald*, its popish antagonist, as an invention of its own, and denounced as a scandalous fabrication; and further the *Bengal Catholic Herald* published from the Vicars General of the different dioceses referred to by us, letters written expressly for the purpose of denying or invalidating the statements transcribed from our pages. Under these circumstances we have been appealed to by the *Calcutta Christian Advocate;* and although we must decline mixing ourselves up in any way with the controversy between the two publications in question, we now furnish, in justice to ourselves, the details of the intelligence of which the paragraph which has so forcibly excited the wrath of the Romanists, both in India and in France, was a summary. Our information was derived from different publications, and chiefly from a series of articles, documents, and letters, in the *Archives du Christianisme*, the organ of a section of the French Protestants, in which the proceedings of the *Société E'vangélique* are usually reported. The first of them is an article in the *Archives* of April 13, 1844, from which the following are extracts:—

"Villefavard is a borough in the *arrondissement* of Bellac, Haute-Vienne (*diocese of Limoges*). Twelve years ago the inhabitants, about six hundred in number, separated, almost to a man, from the Roman Church, from motives unknown to us, and with which we have no concern, and called among them a priest of the 'French Catholic Church.' For twelve years that priest officiated peaceably in a Church built expressly for this purpose at the expense of the inhabitants; the entire population, with one or two exceptions, had rallied round him, and there was no Romish priest in the place. At the end of last year, without any new fact transpiring to provoke such a proceeding, the authorities, applying a general measure to Villefavard, prohibited the 'French Catholic' priest from continuing his functions, and caused seals to be affixed to the place of worship. . . .

"At this period a *colporteur* of Bibles and New Testaments arrived in the place. The word of God was dispersed, made its way, and was read in every house. There, as everywhere, it carried light and conviction to the mind and the heart. At the commencement of January last, a letter addressed to the reformed consistory of Paris, *requested the consistory, in the name of the inhabitants, to establish Protestant worship among them, declaring that they were resolved to join the Reformed Church.* The consistory was unable to take any practical cognizance of the letter, Villefavard being altogether beyond the reach of its operations, and passed to the order of the day. They then addressed themselves to the *Société E'vangélique* of France, and shortly

after *one hundred heads of families of Villefavard addressed to M. Le Pasteur Napoléon Roussel a request signed by them, to come among them to preach the Gospel.* M. Roussel complied with this appeal, and he would have failed to his ministry and betrayed his Master, had he not done so. M. Roussel first of all applied for and obtained a delegation from the consistory of Lezay. Having arrived at Villefavard, M. Roussel declared to the municipal authority, in writing, his intention to celebrate the Protestant worship, and obtained an acknowledgment of this declaration; he also applied for and obtained from the maire the permission required by Art. 294 of the penal code, respecting the use of the locality in which the worship was to be celebrated. It is clear, therefore, that M. Roussel has omitted none of the formalities prescribed, even according to the pretensions of the authorities, the construction of the law adopted by the *Cour de Cassation*, and the circular of the minister of justice and worship, of the 28th of February last. Notwithstanding the delegation of the nearest consistory, notwithstanding the declaration made by him, notwithstanding the permission given by the maire, the prefect of the department has formally interdicted the evangelic religious assemblies at Villefavard, by a decree of the 5th instant, which has been served upon M. Roussel by a lieutenant of gendarmes. The following is a copy of this new act of *bon plaisir*.

"Department of Haute-Vienne. Limoges, April 5, 1844.—"We, Master of Requests, Prefect of the Haute-Vienne, considering the law of the 18th Germinal, year X; the articles 291, 292, and 294 of the Penal Code; the decree of the *Cour de Cassation* of April 22, 1843; the circular of the Minister of Justice and Worship of the 28th of February last; the official statements of the 31st of March and the 4th and 5th of April last; from which it appears that numerous assemblies, called by the *Sieur* Roussel, Protestant pastor, have taken place at Villefavard on three different occasions, the said assemblies having for their object the celebration of Protestant worship;

"Considering that no one inhabitant of Villefavard belongs to the Reformed Church, and that consequently the interference of the *Sieur* Roussel is without object, and cannot in good faith be claimed;

"Considering moreover that he has not provided himself with the authorisation prescribed by Art. 291 of the Penal Code;

"Decree as follows:

"The religious assemblies for Protestant worship which have taken place at Villefavard under the direction of the *Sieur* Roussel are formally interdicted under the penalties enacted by law;

"The authorities will immediately proceed to close the place of the assemblies interdicted by the preceding article, and to affix seals to the doors;

"Any infringement of the foregoing orders will be officially taken in evidence and notified to the tribunals, without prejudice to such measures of coercion as the importance of the circumstances may render necessary.

"The Sub-prefect of Bellac is specially charged to direct, superintend, and insure the execution of the present decree by all legal measures, to give it every possible publicity, and to cause it to be notified to the proprietor of the locality as well as to the *Sieur* Roussel.

"Done and decreed at the Prefecture of Limoges, April 5, 1844.

Signed: T. Morisot."

"The prefect, who had evidently taken instructions beforehand in a higher quarter, had, it is plain, lost no time; for his decree, dated April 5, is founded partly upon the official statements of March 31, April 4, and the same 5th of April. The object was to prevent the celebration of worship, as intended, on the next following day, April 7, being Easter-day, in the same manner as it had been celebrated in the presence of from 400 to 500 persons, on Sunday, March 31, Thursday the 4th, and Friday the 5th of April. On the 6th three gendarmes, under the orders of a lieutenant, arrived at Villefavard. M. Roussel having loudly and before witnesses protested against the seals being affixed, the lieutenant replied that he should proceed. M. Roussel then required his protest to be entered in the official statement. Two gendarmes were left at Villefavard to see the decree of the prefect observed, and to give evidence of any infringement which might take place. They will not have the

trouble of doing so. M. Roussel has very wisely retreated before the employment of physical force. The tribunals will decide the question. . . . .

"We shall take care to acquaint our readers with the sequel of this affair, which is the more important and worthy of notice, because *the evangelic movement of Villefavard is not the only one, but in other localities as well entire populations declare that they renounce Romish worship, and intend to embrace the religion of the Gospel.*"

The following extracts are taken from a letter of M. Roussel to the editor of the *Archives*, dated "Villefavard, July 8th, 1844," and inserted in the *Archives* of July 27th :—

"After the seals had been affixed, I left Villefavard to regulate my affairs, to fetch my family, and to come and settle in this parish. On my return, I continued to hold religious assemblies as heretofore, from house to house, refraining withal, at the request of the inhabitants, from holding assemblies of a more public character, until the arrival of the answer from the minister to a petition which they had addressed to him in my absence. On the other hand, the Consistory of Lezay, which had sent M. Bourchenin to visit the place, explained to the minister the importance and the extent of the religious movement which had taken place in this locality. *The answer of the Keeper of the Seals has at length arrived, and on Sunday last the solemn opening of our worship has taken place, with the assistance of M. Bellivier, pasteur and president of the Consistory of Lezay, and of M. Gibaud, pasteur and president of the Consistory of Lamothe Saint Héray.*"

The letter goes on to detail the efforts made by three Romish priests, sent one after another, for the purpose of arresting the movement if possible, and the discussions which M. Roussel had with one of them, and then continues :—

"As nobody here would let a place to say mass in, the Romish clergy have been obliged to buy at the rate of 6500 francs a shell, which with the field attached to it, is worth but 1200 francs. But the owner took care to stipulate that he was not selling himself, and that he was not going to attend mass. In short, the best proof how unanimous the parish is in rejecting Romanism, is that although the mass has been established for four months, with the approbation of the sub-prefect and the protection of gendarmes, no inhabitant of Villefavard has ever attended. They have had to pay at the rate of twenty-five or fifty centimes a head, to get two or three women from the neighbouring parishes to attend. Upon one occasion, however, they wished to have a procession; they gathered together thirty women, and distributed some five franc pieces, which, as a woman said who is now standing before me, 'we went to spend at a public house.' Another proof how fruitless their attempts are, is this; the present priest is at the same time a licensed teacher; he offers his services gratuitously, and has not yet got more than one single pupil. All the others prefer paying our Protestant schoolmaster, to sending their children gratis to be taught by the priest.

"Yesterday, then, our Protestant worship was installed in the old Roman Catholic Church. . . . Some say there were 1200 people from this and the neighbouring parishes present: I believe I shall be nearer the truth by estimating the attendance at one-half that number. At all events, it is certain that for two hours the Church was densely thronged, and a crowd standing outside, all attentive, devout, and I hope seriously impressed. . . .

"In consequence of this assembly, *several persons who had already asked me to visit their parishes, renewed their entreaties. It would be imprudent to name the places;* but I may at least express my conviction that *the spark which has fallen in the centre of the department, will soon kindle in all directions*, and I will wait till the work is accomplished before I tell you of it.

"Meanwhile *here is a parish of more than* 600 *souls which has passed over entirely, bag and baggage, with its maire, its priest, and its Church, to the evangelic faith, or at least to evangelic worship.* If all are not converted to the Lord, all at least will now have the opportunity of hearing God's word."

To this letter the editor of the *Archives* adds the following note:—

"Subsequent letters show that *this remarkable movement is gaining strength and extension*, both in the Haute-Vienne (diocese of Limoges), and in the Charente Inférieure (diocese of La Rochelle). On Sunday, July 14, *M. Roussel preached at Balledens, a league and a half from Villefavard, at six in the morning, to* 200 *persons, who all have been hitherto Roman Catholics. He was sent for by the maire, the adjunct, the members of the municipal council, and all the inhabitants capable of writing their names.* The same day, at ten o'clock, there were 250 to 300 hearers at Villefavard, and *at three o'clock he again preached two leagues and a half from Villefavard.* Besides this *a Church is forming at Limoges.* M. Roussel is no longer able to attend to them all, and *it is to be apprehended that the movement will spread too fast;* he urgently asks his colleagues to come and help him. *Four active and well-disposed ministers of the Gospel would find here a vast and splendid field for labour*, and the *Société Évangélique* of France would not hesitate to pay their charges. God grant that this simple and energetic appeal may be heard. *Nothing like this has been witnessed in France since the days of the Reformation.*"

Another letter from M. Roussel, of July 22d, in the same number of the *Archives*, contains additional particulars of his success at Balledens, and of the total failure of all the attempts made by the Romish priesthood to retain the inhabitants in the communion of their Church. Their offers to make the place, which was hitherto only a *succursale*, a regular *cure*, to erect a parsonage, &c., were rejected. On the contrary, steps were taken by the inhabitants for permanently protestantizing the village:—

"They drew up and signed a petition to the minister, which I think superfluous, as I am invited and authorized by the maire. I must, however, do the superior authority (which I believe is aware of the real state of the case) the justice of saying, that not the least obstruction was offered to this new establishment of our worship."

In another letter of August 5, 1844, contained in the *Archives* of August 10, M. Roussel relates the particulars of an interference on the part of the prefect, to stop the progress of the movement at Balledens, and then continues:—

"Meanwhile, there were yesterday at Balledens, not 200 persons, as on the first, nor 250, as on the second and third occasions; but 500, who had come to hear the Gospel preached. Two hundred of them could not find room, and remained at our door instead of going to hear mass, which was celebrated at the same hour. I ought to say, however, that this concourse is partly accounted for by the circumstance of its being the day of the patron saint; but still it remains to be explained, why they came to celebrate St. Stephen's day, not at mass, but at the Protestant preaching-house."

M. Roussel next relates, that at the moment of his departure from Limoges, whither the Protestants of that place had invited him, he was summoned before the *juge d'instruction*, at Bellac, as the first step of a prosecution against him, ostensibly on account of some of his controversial tracts, but in reality for the purpose of putting an end to his active labours in the diocese of Limoges. He also mentions a further attempt made by the Romanists at Villefavard, to take advantage of the feast of the patron saint, to make a Romish demonstration in the shape of a procession, which was a complete failure, as not one inhabitant of the place joined it.

Again, the number of the *Archives* of September 14, contains under the head, "*Opening of Worship at Limoges*," an article from which we extract the following passages :—

"*The new Opening of Evangelic Worship has just taken place at Limoges.* The solemnity took place on the 1st of September . . . . . The number of known Protestants in this city is one hundred ; many more will no doubt make themselves known by-and-bye. There was therefore no reason to expect a congregation of more than 30 or 40 persons ; yet although there were many reasons to think that few Roman Catholics would come, although a report had been innocently spread, that the Protestant worship was not public, about 250 persons assembled in an exceedingly remote locality."

The number of the *Archives* for October 26, contains another letter from M. Roussel, in which he says :—

"Of Villefavard and Balledens I shall have no more reports to give you, as these posts have been transferred to the direction and charge of the *Société Évangélique*. . . . . Two pastors have been sent there, and two schools opened. Villefavard to a man, and one-half of Balledens, are completely attached to our worship ; and in the latter place we are daily gaining more ground."

He then describes the efforts made by the Romish clergy in the cathedral town of Limoges to prejudice the people against the Protestants, and not only to prevent the latter from obtaining a suitable locality for the celebration of their worship, but to make it a matter of difficulty for a Protestant to get even a private lodging. Under these circumstances M. Roussel makes an appeal for pecuniary contributions for the erection of a Protestant temple, in order to secure permanently the establishment of Protestantism in the heart of the diocese.

So much for the diocese of Limoges. Similar facts are stated, though with less detail, touching the neighbouring dioceses of *La Rochelle* and *Bordeaux*. The former is mentioned in the editor's postscript to M. Roussel's letter in the *Archives* of July 12th, and is again named in two other statements to which we shall presently refer, as the scene of Protestant movements. It is also referred to in a paragraph in the *Espérance* of October 4th, 1844, where it is said :—

"The movement towards Protestantism which has manifested itself in the Charente Inférieure (diocese of La Rochelle) continues to be very promising. Seven or eight evangelists are constantly employed in this interesting work."

And in an article, dated from Paris, in the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung* of October 13th, 1844, in which the establishment of the Protestant worship at Villefavard is also related, the following statement occurs :—

"The Consistory of Saintes (*diocese of La Rochelle*), in whose district principally this remarkable movement has taken place, is careful to watch over it, and has empowered President Delon and his colleagues to interpose for the interests of the Gospel and the Reformed Church. The Minister of Worship will, it is hoped, lose no time in recognizing the religious wants of about twenty-five parishes, and organzing a consistory in the district, or ranging them under the neighbouring consistories."

The occurrence in the diocese of *Bordeaux* created a great sensation, in consequence of the ridiculous regulation of the prefect, who attempted to limit the number of worshippers to twenty-six, and those twenty-six only the identical individuals enumerated by name in his

official list: an interference with the freedom of worship which of itself proves the dread in which the Romanists in those parts are of the spread of Protestant principles among their population. The whole story, too long to be transferred to our pages, is contained in the *Archives* of September 28th and October 26th, which contain the official documents issued by the authorities, and the correspondence between the Protestant pastors and the prefect of the department: a notice of it also occurs in the *Archives* of October 12th, which concludes with the following general statement:—

"It is not in the power of any one here below to arrest Christian proselytism. Ask in the Haute-Vienne (*diocese of Limoges*), in the Deux-Sèvres (*diocese of Poitiers*), *and in many other places, where the people in hundreds and in thousands leave the Popish mass for the preaching of the Gospel.*"

In reference to the last named diocese, *Poitiers*, a communication from Geneva, November 25th, 1844, states that thirty parishes, which had expelled their curates, and been without church ordinances since 1830, were now asking for Protestant pastors [1].

The diocese of *Chalons* was the scene of the prosecution against M. Roussel, for tracts written by him ten years before, some copies of which were seized at Vitry-le-Français, with a view both to withdraw M. Roussel from his active labours in the Limousin, and to arrest the progress of Protestant opinions in the diocese of Chalons itself. The history of that ridiculous prosecution, which ended in the acquittal of all the accused, is contained in the *Archives* of December 14th, and a full report of the trial before the Court of Assizes of the Department de la Marne (the diocese of Chalons) is given in the *Espérance* of December 10th. In accounting for these proceedings, which excited much attention at the time, an article on the subject in the *Archives* of December 14th expressly states, that they were occasioned by the spread of Protestantism, and mentions "the parish of Glannes, and some other parishes of the same department," as instances of the effect produced by the dissemination of Protestant tracts.

Touching the diocese of *Verdun*, it is not only included in the general statement which we shall presently transcribe in connexion with the diocese of Fréjus, but it appears from the *Archives* of February 24th, 1844, that in the early part of that month a formal application was made to the local authorities, and favourably received by them, and transmitted to the Minister of Worship, for the establishment of Protestant worship in the cathedral town of Verdun itself.

Lastly, with regard to the diocese of *Fréjus*, the *Archives* of April

[1] This or a similar statement in some journal, which we cannot, at this distance of time, trace out, in addition to the general statement in the *Archives*, induced us to include the diocese of Poitiers in our enumeration. As we give it above, it is contained in the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung*, of December 15th, 1844; but as that had not yet reached our hands when we wrote the article, we must have gathered its substance from some other source. Still the reference to the *Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung* serves to show that such a statement was, at that period, in circulation in the journals.

27, contain the following petition addressed to the Chamber of Deputies by the Roman Catholic inhabitants of several parishes in that diocese, dated March 31, 1844 :—

"We, the undersigned, proprietors and inhabitants of the parishes of Cagnes, Saint-Laurent and Cannes, in the arrondissement de Grasse, and Département du Var (the diocese of Fréjus), being all members of the so-called Roman Catholic Church, have the honour to state to the honourable deputies,

"1. That we are more than doubtful respecting the religion taught us by the priests; being fully convinced that they have instilled into our forefathers, under pain of being delivered up to the secular arm, doctrines contrary to, or not ordained by, the Word of God;

"2. That it is the desire of our souls to recover that religion which Jesus Christ has instituted, which the apostles have taught, and to unite ourselves for this purpose to the Reformed Christian Church called Protestant.

"But that, as we cannot assemble together for common prayer, without our municipal authorities threatening, at the instigation of the priests, to proceed against us, and to apply to us the art. 291 of the Penal Code;

"We, therefore, most humbly and respectfully request our honourable deputies, to define, if Art. V. of the Charter has force of law in our dear fatherland, or to interpret it in such a manner, as to put an end to the arbitrary power by which we are oppressed."

The movement of which this petition testifies, is again referred to in a letter from M. E. Lacroix, of Grenoble, which is contained under the head "Appeal on behalf of the religious movement in France," in the *Archives* of August 24th, 1844; and in which the following passage occurs :—

"Let, both in and out of France, the pastors and the religious journals, with the *Archives* at their head, make collections and open private subscriptions, in order to procure the means of sending missionaries to *those populations* which in the Var (diocese of Fréjus), in the Charente-Inférieure (diocese of Rochelle), in the Oise, in the Haute Marne, in the Haute Vienne (diocese of Limoges), *and elsewhere, are loudly asking to be evangelized.*"

And in the *Archives* of October 26, 1844, there is an article to the following effect :—

"The evangelic movement which has manifested itself in the department of the Haute Vienne, (diocese of Limoges,) of the Charente Inférieure, (diocese of La Rochelle,) of the Meuse, (diocese of Verdun,) and of the Marne, (diocese of Chalons,) is going forward also in the Var (diocese of Fréjus). The following statement is contained in the *Catholique Apostolique*, a Christian journal published at Marennes. 'In the department of the Var *about ten parishes have rejected the erroneous traditions of the Roman Church*, and among them are Cannes, Cagnes, La Gaude, and Saint-Laurent, the principal inhabitants of which have lately addressed a petition to the Chamber of Deputies in favour of religious liberty. The pastors of Marseilles, an evangelist, and a *colporteur*, are unable to hold all the religious assemblies for which they are called upon on all sides; notwithstanding the zeal with which M. Roize, ex-*curé* of one of these parishes, who has laid aside the cassock and band, spends himself wholly in evangelizing the inhabitants of his former parish. The greater part of the flock has followed in the footsteps of the pastor, and now both are in the way of salvation. As of old the disciples of Jerusalem did not recognize Saul of Tarsus in the habit and language of St. Paul, so the inhabitants of the Var have been greatly surprised, and scarcely able to believe that the Abbé Roize had become a Bible Christian, and a preacher of the Gospel as it is taught in Holy Scripture itself."

To these particulars of the different dioceses mentioned in our state-

ment, we subjoin the following extract from the annual report of the *Société Évangélique* of France, which was read at the eleventh anniversary of the society, and is contained, with an account of the meeting, in the *Archives* of April 27, 1844.

"The following are a few examples of the evangelic movement in which we rejoice. In the department of * * *, one of our evangelists stationed in the midst of about a hundred populous parishes, is entreated on all sides to hold assemblies for reading and explaining the Bible. He has already been enabled to attend in a great many places, and to preside over assemblies of 60, of 200, and even of 300 persons, who were really attentive, and took the liveliest interest in the things declared to them. A pastor in one of the towns of the department in question, has earnestly besought the committee to send immediately a minister of the Gospel in order to meet so serious a demand. Being unable to comply with this request, the committee has, for the present at least, sent a second evangelist, who has presided over numerous and blessed assemblies. At * * * he had first 25, then 60, then 200 hearers. At * * * he had 90; and afterwards, on the Sunday, he held in one and the same place three assemblies, at each of which more than 100 persons were present. On Monday he had 150, on Tuesday 220, and on Wednesday 250 hearers. He has written quite recently that a great door is opened, and that there is a pressing demand for several evangelists.

"In another district of the same department a similar movement manifests itself; an evangelist has gathered around him as many as 500 persons anxious to know thoroughly the doctrine of the Gospel.

"In quite a different part of France the same facts have been reproduced. The evangelist who there exercises his ministry thus writes: 'At * * * I had the opportunity of preaching in an old convent to 250 persons. At R * * and at B * * forty families ask me to hold meetings, and to instruct them. At * * * 500 persons are firmly resolved to obtain, even at a sacrifice, the establishment of Protestant worship amongst them; they have made up their minds henceforward to follow the religion of the Bible. In a neighbouring town a protestant burial has drawn together 600 spectators and hearers, and there also the establishment of Protestant worship is urgently demanded.'

"In another place, again, one of our agents being requested to hold religious assemblies in a locality which he had never visited, announced the Gospel to more than 300 attentive hearers; tracts have been distributed, and read with seriousness; and there is an unanimous desire expressed for the continuance of the assemblies for worship.

"At *Villefavard*, a parish of from 600 to 700 souls in the Haute Vienne, an analogous movement has manifested itself. A New Testament which fell into the hands of the former priest of the parish, made him anxious to be instructed in the evangelic faith. A *colporteur* was immediately sent. The inhabitants showed themselves unanimously anxious to hear a minister of the Gospel. The committee delegated for the purpose one of its members, *M. le pasteur Roussel.*"

The rest of the story of Villefavard is already known to our readers. Lastly, it deserves to be mentioned as a proof of the extent and importance of these movements, that they led to a proposal, which created much discussion at the time among the French Protestants, on the part of M. Roussel, to remedy the want of ordained ministers to meet the demand, by ordaining devout laymen for this work without the usual requirement of a regular theological education. This proposal is contained in a letter from M. Roussel, dated Limoges, Nov. 4, 1844, in the *Archives* of Nov. 9. We must content ourselves with giving from it the following paragraph:—

"I shall not enumerate *the departments and the parishes in which numerous Catholics call in vain for Protestant pastors; they are sufficiently known to the readers of our reli-*

gious journals. I will only observe, that in most of those localities they are no longer satisfied with *colporteurs*, who have already done their work there; nor with simple evangelists who cannot administer the sacraments, and thus necessarily leave the populations, in a state as yet but little enlightened, in contact with the Romish priests. What they want, are consecrated men, able not only to instruct them in doctrine, but to baptize, to administer the communion, to solemnize marriages, to bury the dead; in one word, an ecclesiastic is wanted in each parish, unless the people are to fall back under the influence from which they so much desire to escape. Give us a pastor, they say, and we are yours; but so long as *M. le Curé* can refuse to bury our parents, and to baptize our children, we cannot connect ourselves with your worship, which is confined to a lecture and prayer."

These are the data on which our statement was founded. With the exception of one or two statistical details, they were all taken from the leading organs of the Protestants in France; many of the particulars are authenticated by documentary evidence; and the main facts both formed the subject of discussion in public bodies, and were referred to again and again in the Protestant journals of Paris as matters of public notoriety. Nor were they denied by the Romanists in France, who could not be ignorant of these statements. We watched the *Ami de la Religion*, which is not slow to contradict statements unfavourable to the Romish Church, narrowly at the time; but although the statements of the Protestant journals extended over a space of ten months, during which additional facts were constantly adduced, and the former statements referred to as matters of fact which were generally admitted, and occupied the attention of government in various ways, not a word of contradiction escaped the *Ami de la Religion*. Of all the facts thus obtruded upon the notice of the public, the only ones referred to at all in that publication were those which transpired at Verdun and at Villefavard, and with regard to both these the notices of the *Ami de la Religion* went directly to confirm the statements of the Protestant papers. As to Verdun, two angry paragraphs appeared, one in the number of March 26th, the other in that of May 11th. In the former it was stated as a grievance against M. Martin du Nord, the Minister of Worship, that "the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans of Verdun had obtained an authorization to assemble together for worship;" and it was sneeringly stated, that being unable to afford a pastor, they were placed under the guidance of an elder, "according to their discipline." The latter paragraph is too characteristic not to be given entire :—

"The town of *Verdun* has been gratified in its turn by a Protestant chapel, and an *Evangelic* pastor. This is how it happened: the Rhine provinces, and the countries adjoining the Luxemburg, send forth periodically nomad workmen, who come to drive their trade in France. A score of these artizans are gathered at Verdun, and have had the idea of applying to the Ministry of Worship for an authorization to open an oratory, suggested to them. The permission was not long in coming; in the reply, the different agents of the administration have been told, that in similar cases they are to show all readiness, and to smoothe down all obstacles to the erection of preaching-houses in the localities which call for them. Here, then, is a city where Catholicism has always reigned undivided, which now sees error take root within its walls, and pave the way for the most fatal proselytism. There is enough in these facts to enlighten the most blind, and to reveal to France the tendencies of the men of the revolution."

As regards the transactions at Villefavard, the *Ami de la Religion* of March 23d, 1844, states, after referring to the previous condition of the parish under a priest of the "*prétendue Église Française*," that during Lent a priest from Limoges was sent thither to reclaim the "*esprits égarés;*" but that "he was unable to succeed;" and, moreover, that "there had arrived at Villefavard two Protestants, one of whom was a minister." On the 11th of May, an extract from a local paper, the *Avenir National*, is given, which contains no new facts, but confirms those previously stated, with a plentiful accompaniment of abuse. On the 11th of June, there comes a paragraph which represents the parish in a fair way of being reclaimed from protestantism, the inhabitants having received the newly-appointed *curé* with great deference, and being busily employed in rebuilding his parsonage; but that happy vision is again dispelled by another extract from the *Avenir National*, in the *Ami de la Religion* of August 13th, which recapitulates in the most virulent style the events which took place during the interregnum of the *Église Française* in the parish, and concludes by saying: "*Then those events occurred which have occupied public attention in so lively a manner, and have ended in the enthronization of protestantism in this parish.*" How far the diocesan authorities thought the movement in the diocese important, may be inferred from the following passage of the pastoral, published by the new bishop on his arrival in the diocese in August, 1844, and which is given in the *Ami de la Religion* of August 20th; the passage in question being marked in italics: "*We shall keep our eyes continually open, for fear of our flocks being stolen from us, and our sheep being exposed to the ravening wolf.*"

We have now furnished our readers with the evidence on which our statement rested; evidence put forth under every circumstance of credibility, and left uncontradicted, in those points in which it was not confirmed, by the official organ of the Romanists in France. We might have easily swelled our catalogue of dioceses; there were data which would have justified us in adding the names of Langres, Beauvais, Valence, Avignon, and Versailles; but the facts were of less importance, and we contented ourselves with enumerating those dioceses in which facts of some consequence had transpired.

We shall now simply transcribe our statement, as it originally appeared, Vol. ii. p. 501; leaving our readers after the perusal of the foregoing evidence to judge whether we were not perfectly justified in making it.

"A strong movement in opposition to the Roman Catholic Church, and in favour of Protestantism, is taking place in the dioceses of Verdun, Châlons, Limoges, Poitiers, La Rochelle, Bordeaux, and Fréjus. In the last-named diocese, in which ten parishes have almost unanimously renounced Romanism, a Romish priest, the Abbé Roize, is among the converts, and takes an active part in preaching among his former parishioners. In the diocese of La Rochelle the number of parishes which desire to be placed under Protestant pastors, is stated at twenty-five. In the diocese of Limoges, the principal agent in producing these changes is M. Roussel, a Protestant minister, who has established a congregation at Limoges, and brought the entire population of Villefavard over to Protestantism, and against whom a prosecution has been directed on account of 'language injurious to a religion

recognized by the state.' In the diocese of Bordeaux, the proprietor of an estate, who, with a number of his servants and tenants, had separated himself from the Roman Church, procured the services of a Protestant minister from the nearest consistory, and had divine service periodically celebrated at his *château;* when the local authorities interfered, and being unable to prohibit the assembly altogether, affixed to the door a list of the names of twenty-six Protestants, declaring, at the same time, their intention to proceed against any one who, not being included in the list, should nevertheless attend divine service there. The affair has created a considerable sensation in the neighbourhood, and is to be brought before a superior tribunal."

Nothing could be more consistent with the office of recording the leading events of the religious history of our own times, (which is the task we have proposed to ourselves in this department of our review,) than such a summary of events which had excited so much attention in France. The animus with which we drew up this summary, is yet further apparent from the concluding part of the paragraph:

"That Protestantism is, on the whole, progressing in France, is evident from a statistical statement made in the course of the debates in the Chambers during the last session. From this it appears, that at the close of the empire, in the year 1815, the number of Protestant ministers in France was 464; in the year 1830, it amounted to 527; and in the year 1843, to 677: the sum charged in the budget for their support was, under the empire, 306,000 francs; during the restoration it rose to 675,000 francs; and in the year 1843, it had reached the sum of 1,219,000 francs. The number of Protestant congregations without church or minister was stated at 111 at that time, but has probably much increased since."

The statistical data thus adduced in confirmation of the general statement, that Protestantism is on the increase in France, were at the time going the round of the Journals. They were derived from authentic sources, and have since been reproduced by the *Ami de la Religion*, January 30, 1845, from the *Journal des Débats*, without one syllable of question as to their accuracy, and with the additional information, that at the time of writing, within two years after the date of the above return, the number of ministers had been yet further increased, and was then upwards of seven hundred.

We cannot make room for the letters of the Vicars-General of the seven dioceses mentioned by us, to their correspondent at Agra, which were intended to bear out the assertion of the "Bengal Catholic Herald," that the statement in question was nothing more than an idle fabrication from beginning to end. They are as curious specimens in their way of the *fortiter in re*, as the accompanying remarks of the "Bengal Catholic Herald" are of the "*suaviter in modo*." But our concern is not with either; we desire to keep out of reach of the fragrant missiles which the "Herald" and the "Advocate" hurl at each other, under the burning sun of India; and having amply justified the part taken by ourselves in this matter as chroniclers of contemporary events, we would suggest to the Vicars-General of the seven dioceses, that it would come with much better grace, and above all, with much greater force, if they were, even at this eleventh hour, to contradict, in the face of the French Protestant Journals, the statements made by them, than to send out their denials to the far East, where there is no one to answer their assertions.

Italy. *Death of the Pope.*—Pope Gregory XVI. died suddenly at Rome, on Whit-Monday the 1st of June, between nine and ten in the morning, after a short illness of only a week's duration. He had been suffering for a few days from erysipelas in the left leg, but no alarming symptoms showed themselves till the night of the 31st of May. He had communicated early in the morning of that day, being the day of Pentecost. In the night, feeling the approach of death, he sent for his confessor: but before he could arrive, he made his last confession to one of the Prelates attached to his household, and received extreme unction.

Gregory XVI. was born at Belluno on the 18th of September, 1765; and was therefore in his eighty-first year. His name was Mauro Capellari; in early life he entered the order of the Benedictines of Camaldoli, in which he distinguished himself by his theological and philological erudition. He was made a Cardinal by Pope Leo XII. on the 13th of March, 1826, and at his death in 1829 would have been elected to the Pontificate, but for the influence of Austria. Within two years after, however, on the death of Pius VIII., his election was carried, and he succeeded to the papal chair on the 2nd of February, 1831. In his private character he was chiefly distinguished by his love of literature and of the arts. Of his public character the *Ami de la Religion*, adopting the language of the *Quotidienne*, thus speaks: "Gregory XVI. was the expression of that temperate Papacy, which seems to suit an age in which there is no public faith. Some desired that he should venture to represent the Papacy entirely detached from all, so called, temporal interests; determined to yield everything to the ambitious passions of the political world, and to rest content with a rosary and a wooden cross. It must be confessed that in this respect the most daring counsels were offered to Gregory XVI.; but fortunately Rome has not yet fallen under the empire of chimeras."

The *Ami de la Religion* entertains its readers on this occasion with an account of the ceremonies observed after the death of the Pope, and at the election of a successor. Immediately on the intelligence of the Pope's decease, the Cardinal Chamberlain proceeds to the chamber of death, where the *annulus piscatoris* is delivered up to him. This, and the seal used for sealing the bulls, are broken to pieces three days after. Twenty-four hours after death the body is embalmed, and in the evening of the third day conveyed to the Cathedral of St. Peter's with the same state which attended him during his lifetime in his solemn processions. There the body lies in state for three days, the people kissing the feet of the corpse through the railing behind which it is laid. The funeral ceremonies occupy nine days, reckoning from the day on which the body is removed to St. Peter's. After the funeral the mass of the Holy Ghost is chanted by the Dean of the College of Cardinals, and a preacher especially appointed exhorts the Cardinals to proceed without delay to the election of a successor. Thence the Cardinals proceed in procession to the conclave, and having

been sworn to the observance of the "Apostolical Constitutions" and the laws of the conclave, enter upon the business of the election.

Originally the election of the bishops of Rome was conducted in the same way as that of other bishops; and the Roman people had a voice in it. In 1179, the third Lateran Council deprived both the clergy and the people of Rome of their ancient privileges, and vested the power of nominating the successor to the Papal see exclusively in the college of cardinals, making the validity of the election dependent on a majority of two-thirds of the entire number of votes. The cardinals exercised this power in the first instance without any restraint, meeting only at the time appointed for collecting the votes; an arrangement which gave so free a scope to intrigues, that through the impossibility of uniting in any one person a sufficient number of votes, the elections were often inconveniently protracted. At the death of Clement IV., in 1268, this evil grew to such a height, that the Papal see remained vacant for three entire years, in spite of the remonstrances of Father (afterwards Cardinal) Bonaventura, when at last the military governor of Viterbo, where the election was held, reduced the sacred college to unanimity by shutting up its members in the house in which they had assembled to vote, and, as this would not answer, taking the roof off the house. Under these circumstances, Gregory X. was elected in 1271, and to avoid the recurrence of a similar scandal, the Council of Lyons passed, in 1274, those rules by which the cardinals have ever since been shut up in conclave until the election is terminated. Originally the conclave used to be held wherever the Papal Court resided at the time when the vacancy occurred; but by degrees it became customary to hold it at Rome, except under extraordinary circumstances; formerly at the Vatican, and since the death of Pius VII. at the Quirinal.

The election may take place in one of three ways; either, first, by acclamation, or as it is also called "inspiration," without any formal process of voting; or, secondly, by compromise, the nomination being committed to the hands of one or more members of the college by common consent, it being found impossible to unite two-thirds of the votes for one man; or, thirdly, which is the more ordinary course, by scrutiny, and if that should not prove decisive, by accession; that is, by the concentration of votes, in one or more subsequent scrutinies, upon one or other of those who in the first scrutiny had obtained a large, but still insufficient number of votes. The scrutiny takes place twice a day, and day after day, until a decisive majority is obtained; after every scrutiny which does not give such a majority, the voting papers are thrown into wet straw, and burned in a small fire-place behind the altar of the Pauline chapel where the conclave is held, the smoke from which rising about noon, or in the evening, is an intimation to the people of Rome that no pope has as yet been elected.

When the scrutiny terminates in a decisive majority, the dean of the college, accompanied by the great officers of state of the order, places himself before the table of the cardinal on whom the election has fallen,

and puts to him the question, "Do you agree to this canonical election of yourself to the Sovereign Pontificate." The question being answered in the affirmative, the election is completed; the new pope, in answer to a second question from the dean, declares what name he means to take; he is habited in the papal robes, and receives the homage of the assembled cardinals. The election is then proclaimed to the people from the grand balcony of the palace by one of the cardinal deacons; immediately after which, the firing of one hundred and one guns, and the ringing of bells from the 366 steeples of Rome, carry the news that "the chair of St. Peter" is again filled, all over the "Eternal City."

The sacred college consists at this moment of sixty-two cardinals, of whom three are French, three Austrians, one a Portuguese, one a Spaniard, one a Belgian, one, Cardinal Acton, though born at Naples, of English descent, and the rest Italians. We shall conclude this notice by transcribing the following curious reflections of the *Ami de la Religion*, on the intrigues which undeniably take place at every papal election, and which agree but ill with the high pretensions put forth by the Papacy. "It is in their private conversations (during the intervals of the sittings of the conclave), that the members of the sacred college discuss among themselves the claims of the cardinals who have the greatest chance of being raised to the pontifical throne. These secret negotiations, these goings to and fro, this conflict of contrary opinions, these reciprocal concessions, these sometimes very protracted fluctuations, these gains and losses of votes, constitute the dramatic and purely human part of the important proceedings of this assembly. Here that beautiful saying of Fenelon, '*L'homme marche et Dieu le mène*,' finds its application. The Holy Ghost ceases not to aid his Church, and we entertain the firm confidence that He will graciously frustrate all intrigues, if there are any, or make them subservient to the choice of the worthiest pastor."

The election of the successor of Gregory XVI. took place on the 16th of June, after four scrutinies. The prelate on whom the election fell is Cardinal John-Maria Mastaï-Ferretti, Archbishop of Imola. He has taken the name of Pius IX. He was born at Sinigaglia, on the 13th of May, 1792.

Germany.—*Centenary of Luther's death.* While the Protestants of Germany are upbraiding the Romanists with their excessive veneration for the saints of their calendar, and in their own practice allowing even the ancient festivals of the Church Catholic to fall into general neglect, they have, inconsistently enough, celebrated the centenary of Luther's death, on the 18th of February last, with a degree of pomp and solemnity which cannot but appear extravagant, especially when it is considered that Luther did not die the death of martyrdom, and that, however great his merits were in some respects, the rashness of his opinions and the violence of his conduct had no small share in causing that dissolution of Church order, and that licence of theological criti-

cism and private judgment, of which the rationalistic and infidel excesses of the present day are the deplorable fruits. At Wittenberg the celebration was spread over the space of three days, divided into a "*Vorfeier*," on the 17th, the "*Hauptfeier*," on the 18th, and a "*Nachfeier*," on the 19th, and attended by a great concourse of strangers, including the king of Prussia, and several of the princes, ministers of state, and other civil and ecclesiastical officers, who thus made a kind of Lutheran pilgrimage to the tomb of the reformer. In other places, too, the localities connected with his personal history were made prominent objects in the arrangement of the solemnity; various relics, even to the pall which covered his coffin, were produced by their fortunate possessors, and at Berlin "the treasures connected with the memory of Luther," which are preserved in the Royal Library, were laid out, as if in imitation of the late exhibition at Trèves, in a public show which lasted for several days, and was visited by thousands; nay, in Erfurth, the performance of a "Jubilant Oratorio," entitled "The Glorification of Martin Luther," afforded a Protestant counterpart to the canonizations of the congregation of Rites. This idea was yet further improved by a lithograph published at Eisleben, which represents Luther standing in the clouds with a wreath of laurel on his head, between two angels with palm branches in their hands. He is looking down to the earth with evident complacency, and there beholds on one side John Ronge holding a candle to the pope, who is reading Ronge's letter to Bishop Arnoldi of Trèves, and on the other side Pastor Uhlich, who holds in his hand a paper with the superscription, "Protestant friends in Eisleben." Though this composition looks amazingly like a caricature, we believe it was got up by some zealous admirers of Luther in the most perfect good faith. No less curious, considering that the solemnity was appointed to celebrate the memory of a confessor of the Christian faith, was the performance, at the theatre at Dresden, expressly in honour of the day, of Lessing's infidel play *Nathan der Weise*. Of busts, portraits, and transparencies of Luther there was everywhere great abundance, both in the churches and in the streets; and medals commemorative of the day were struck and extensively sold. Illuminations, processions by torch-light, assemblies lighted up by coloured fires, protracted the solemnities into the night. In those parts of Germany which are under Roman Catholic governments, the celebration of the day was more or less obstructed; in Bavaria it was altogether prohibited, and the Protestants had to content themselves with the demonstration of closing their shops. Generally speaking, the festivities passed off more quietly than might have been expected, considering their somewhat motley character, and the excited state of the public mind in Germany on the subject of religion; in some places, however, the police was put under requisition for the maintenance of order; and in Nordhausen a transparency, put up by the "Friends of Light," which represented the town at sunrise, with the inscription, "God said, Let there be light; and there was light;" was demolished by a shower of stones. More appropriate to the occasion, and better calculated to do honour to the memory of Luther, is the

collection in various parts, of considerable sums for founding, or, where they already existed, further endowing, schools and charitable institutions. Among these is one, "Martin's Foundation," at Erfurth, recently restored by the munificence of the king of Prussia, which deserves to be particularly noticed, on account of the multitude of objects which it comprises. They are thus enumerated: 1. A refuge for destitute boys. 2. A Sunday school for apprentices sent forth from the former. 3. A training school for the education of poor youths as schoolmasters. 4. A school of industry for girls intended to go out as maidservants. 5. A general school for children under the proper age for confirmation. 6. A fund to supply poor scholars with books and clothing. 7. A Sunday prayer meeting for young people. 8. A week-day school with four class teachers. 9. A school of industry for poor school girls. 10. The same for poor school boys. 11. A training school for domestic servants. 12. A soup fund for the support of 100 poor school children during winter. 13. A preparatory school for beginners. 14. A subsidiary school for those whose instruction has been neglected, especially for young criminals. 15. A school for carrying on the education of young artizans. 16. A general refuge for the education and penitential treatment of strangers and criminals of all sorts. If we might be excused so great a liberty, we would suggest the addition of No. 17, A plain school for teaching over-enlightened professors, doctors and pastors of the Protestant Church, the elements of the Christian faith, as they used to be taught in the good old days of Dr. Martin Luther.

Centenary of Pestalozzi.—Another centenary commemoration took place at Berlin, Cassel, and in several other places, both in Germany and Switzerland, on the 12th of January, the birth-day of Pestalozzi. As the date of his birth is differently stated, by some in 1745, by others in 1746, his disciples and admirers determined to celebrate the day in both years. The intention was to raise subscriptions for founding an agricultural orphan-school, on the plan of the establishment at Neuhof; but in consequence of the prominent part taken in the proposal by some of the leading rationalists of Germany, many who would gladly have contributed to such an institution, if established on Christian principles, withheld their co-operation, and the whole affair will probably end in a failure. The following letter from the king of Prussia, to the managers of the fund at Berlin, will be read with interest, as a testimony both to Christian truth, and the worth of Pestalozzi:—

"Being well acquainted with the character of Pestalozzi's endeavours, which had for their object the moral and intellectual improvement of the people, I could not but approve your intention of establishing an institution for the education of orphans, in honour of his memory; an undertaking which I had a right to assume would be set on foot and executed in conformity with the mind and spirit of Pestalozzi. But the spirit in which Pestalozzi lived and laboured, was a spirit of moral earnestness, of humility and self-denying love, of those Christian virtues, which under a higher impulse he practised all his life, although

it was not till in his later years that he arrived at a definite and clear knowledge of the source from which he derived his strength. For I have heard from his own lips the confession, that he found in Christianity alone that consolation for the last days of his life, which he had before sought in vain in an erroneous direction. It is this spirit, therefore, that must give life and power to any undertaking for the relief of the material and spiritual wants of the people, which shall be worthy of the memory of that noble-hearted man, and a suitable expression of the gratitude due to him from his country. Unfortunately, however, at the late commemoration of Pestalozzi, under your management, views and tendencies were manifested, and put forth even in an offensive manner, which testified of a very different spirit, a spirit to which Pestalozzi was an entire stranger, and which affords me no guarantee that your undertaking will really promote the welfare of the people. Under these circumstances I am constrained for the present to refuse to your intended foundation the support which you have solicited at my hands by your petition of the 8th of January last; but I shall be happy to give to it my full sympathy and co-operation, whenever I shall be convinced that it is not intended to promote party purposes, which are foreign to the object itself, but simply and exclusively to assist in realizing the idea of educating orphans in a spirit of true Christian love and self-denial.

"Berlin, March 21, 1846." (Signed) "Frederic William."

Evangelic Church Conference at Berlin.—The Synod, or rather the Congress of Deputies from the Protestant States of Germany, convoked at the suggestion of the King of Prussia[1], met on the 4th of January of the present year at Berlin, and continued its sittings till the 13th of February. It consisted of deputies from Prussia, Hanover, Würtemberg, Saxony, Baden, Hesse-Darmstadt, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, Weimar, and the other smaller states, with the exception of Oldenburg and the free cities. These, and the two great Roman Catholic powers of Austria and Bavaria, refused to take any part in the deliberations. The number of deputies was thirty-one, representing twenty-six different states and principalities; they held altogether twenty-eight sittings of four or five hours' duration. The questions which they agreed in their preliminary sittings to take into consideration were in all four; 1. Whether it was desirable to continue these conferences at stated intervals, and if so, under what regulations, and for what purposes? 2. How the constitutional question of the Evangelic Church should be dealt with, due regard being had to existing circumstances? 3. Whether the attempt should be made to obtain uniformity of worship in the German Evangelic Church, without destroying the doctrinal or other peculiarities of particular Churches? 4. Whether the confessional question should be taken up, and to what extent?

The first question, the discussion of which occupied two sessions, was unanimously answered in the affirmative; reserving, however,

[1] See English Review, vol. iv. p. 506.

the independence and right of self-government of the different Churches. It was proposed that under the title "the German Evangelic Church Conference," a similar Congress of Deputies should take place, at first every three, and afterwards every five years; the proceedings to be strictly confined to an interchange of communications on matters concerning the general interests of the Protestant Church in Germany, leaving the different governments and Churches free to make of the result of the conferences such use as they shall deem expedient. The place for holding the following conference, to be determined from time to time by the conference then sitting; and the next to be holden at Stuttgardt.

The consideration of the second question, relative to the constitution of the German Evangelic Church, occupied the conference during seven sittings, and gave rise to much animated discussion. The view generally adopted was, that the constitution of the Church was a matter of secondary importance, and merely subsidiary to the right use of the word and sacraments, on which chiefly the well-being of the Church depends. Still it was acknowledged that a proper organization of the Church materially contributes to advance its interests. As regards the government of the Church by consistories (the existing form of Church government in most of the Protestant states of Germany), its advantages in producing uniformity of action, and preventing collisions between the temporal and the spiritual powers, were duly appreciated; but at the same time it was thought that it did not give a sufficient share in the government of the Church to the clergy and the people themselves; that it was calculated to diminish in them the sense of Church membership, and that it did not afford to the superior authority of the state a sufficient opportunity of becoming acquainted with the wants of the Church and the dispositions and wishes of its members. The experience of those provinces in which presbyteries and synods had been called into action, conjointly with, and in subordination to, the consistories, was considered favourable to an extension of that more popular form of Church government. It was agreed on all hands, that to restrict it where it already existed, was out of the question, and with the exception of one single vote, all united in recommending to the different governments the adoption of measures which would tend to give the clergy and the people generally a share in the administration of the affairs of the Church. The following suggestions on this subject were incorporated in the acts of the conference.

1. The congregation to elect lay elders, men of good report and communicants, out of a certain number of candidates, nominated in the first instance by the clergyman, and afterwards by the clergyman and elders conjointly; the elders so chosen to co-operate with the clergyman in quickening and preserving the moral and religious sense of the people, and in promoting the due observance of Sundays and holidays, and in maintaining good order during the celebration of Divine worship, to concur in all liturgical changes, and to have a voice in the election of deputies for the synod, and perhaps to take a part in the superintendence

of schools and the management of the poor. The idea of a popular election of elders was, however, discountenanced by a great majority of the deputies.

2. Synods, consisting of both clerical and lay members, to be convoked at regular intervals of time; and according to circumstances and the extent of each state, the synods to be subdivided, if necessary, into general, provincial, and district synods. General synods to be presided over by a president of their own choice, and their proceedings superintended by a government commissary as the guardian of the rights of the temporal power. The synods to have only a consulting, not a deliberative or deciding voice in Church affairs; to give their opinion on measures proposed by the consistories, which might be abandoned if the voice of the synods was decidedly opposed to them; and to make suggestions as to changes, or remedies of existing evils, which might appear to them desirable. Some of the deputies, however, were of opinion that the synods ought to have a more direct and positive share in the government of the Church.

The third question, respecting the uniformity of worship, engaged the attention of the conference during six sittings. The opinions on this subject were still more conflicting than on the preceding question. After considerable discussion it was agreed that if it were practicable to introduce in some degree uniformity of worship, it would be desirable both as facilitating intercommunion, and as tending to satisfy the wishes of those who desire to see the liturgical indefiniteness which prevails in many parts of Germany put an end to. The consideration of the means, however, for attaining this object, which all acknowledged to be desirable, led to a great diversity of opinions. A majority of deputies united in the proposition for the appointment of a commission, whose business it should be, not only to determine certain general principles, but to undertake the actual arrangement of liturgical formularies, and of psalms and hymns of an approved character. The minority were of opinion that such a commission was altogether out of the question, and that the utmost that could be done, was to obtain instructions from the respective governments to their deputies at the next conference, authorizing them to enter into consultation as to the general principles to be followed in the composition of liturgical and psalmodical collections. Yet all agreed that it would be desirable even for those Churches who were satisfied with their present liturgical arrangements, to take a part in these deliberations and the measures to be founded upon them.

Last of all, the conference proceeded to deliberate upon the confessional question, with a preliminary understanding that no doctrinal discussions were to be admitted. The points for consideration were: 1. the validity of the symbolical books now in existence in the different Churches; 2. the obligation of the preachers to adhere to pure evangelic doctrine; 3. the mode of superintending the preachers as to their faithfulness in complying with this obligation. On the first point it was admitted on all hands that the symbolical books cannot be given up,

and that the conference cannot undertake to modify them; that they must continue in every Church to have such force and validity as has hitherto been attributed to them, and that with this even the adoption of a new common symbol could not interfere. The possibility of a new symbol as the joint expression of the faith of all the Churches being framed, was again acknowledged by all; it being taken for granted that the form of the evangelic symbol need not at all times be unalterably the same, and that the evangelic Church has an undoubted right to develop itself further on the basis on which it stands. At the same time it was considered that the present was not the time for framing a new symbol, and that at all events the conference would be incompetent to do it, as it consisted of representatives, not of the different Churches, but of the different ecclesiastical governments. Again, it was agreed that the dissolution of the common bond of the Augustan confession was not to be contemplated. At the same time the right of each Church to maintain its own particular symbol by the side of the Augustan confession, and to determine the relation in which that and other symbols should stand to each other, was fully recognized. On the second point it was determined that the obligation of the preachers to adhere to pure evangelic doctrine must be maintained, as the condition of admission to the office of public teaching in the Church, and that with this view, in the first place, Holy Scripture is to be positively laid down, as is done in the symbolical books themselves, as the only source, and the absolute standard of Christian faith and conversation; and in the next place, the mode of subscription to this principle, especially with regard to the relation in which the symbolical books stand to Holy Scripture, is to be left unaltered where it is now satisfactory, or if thought to require modification, is to be altered only with the concurrence of the established authorities in the respective Churches; care being taken on the one hand not to encroach upon the freedom of belief and conscience which is the inalienable right of every Protestant; and on the other hand, not to allow that freedom to degenerate into a license of individual teaching. Lastly, as to the mode of superintending the preachers, and guarding their faithfulness to their obligations, it was thought advisable that with all due strictness, great forbearance and mildness should be used, and methods of reconciliation repeatedly attempted before having recourse to ulterior measures; and that the principal object should be to prevent polemical attacks upon the doctrine of the Evangelic Church before the people, and to provide for the edification of the congregations, by a pure and full preaching of the Word of God, in that evangelic spirit which pervades the symbolical books. By such a temperate course it was hoped that the power of truth would prevail in the end, and the Church escape safely from the agitation of these troublous times.

Such is the general outline of the labours of the conference; but even this modicum of agreement is as yet problematic, as on the one hand several of the deputies handed in protests and separate votes on

particular questions; and on the other hand, all the governments, in sending their deputies, have reserved to themselves the power of deliberating separately upon the results of the conference, and giving or refusing, as they shall see fit, their adhesion to the principles adopted by the majority of the assembly. On the whole, the interest of the conference consists chiefly in its having afforded an opportunity for the official and authentic disclosure of the many and great difficulties in which the Churches founded in Germany by Luther and Calvin are involved.

Switzerland.—*Religious Persecution in the Canton de Vaud.*—Notwithstanding the attention and sympathy which the noble conduct of the ministers of the Canton de Vaud has universally excited, and the impossibility of filling up the numerous vacancies caused by the resignation of an overwhelming majority of the clerical body, the radical government of the Canton de Vaud continues to pursue its reckless career. The religious part of the community, which is for the most part attached to the secession ministry, is abandoned to the tender mercies of a ribald mob, and subjected to every species of ill-treatment. Scenes of the most brutal violence have been enacted both at Lausanne and in other places. A few examples may suffice to give an idea of the excesses which, with the open connivance of the authorities, are committed against those who are guilty of no other offence than that of assembling peaceably and with the utmost privacy for the performance of their religious duties. A small congregation assembled in February last, as early as five o'clock on Sunday morning, in the hope of escaping notice, in a country house in the neighbourhood of Lausanne; but by seven o'clock a body of men appeared at the door, and the first person that came out, when the assembly separated, was saluted with a blow from a cudgel, accompanied by the blasphemous exclamation, "*Voilà pour Jésus-Christ.*" Fortunately there was a considerable proportion of males in the assembly, who with some difficulty succeeded in protecting the females. At Montricher fourteen persons assembled on the morning of Sunday, January the 18th, in the most unobtrusive manner, but a crowd assembled, and on their departure from the house, the members of the assembly were followed with hootings and throwing of stones. The master of the house, who held a subordinate office as forester and licensed vender of salt (a government monopoly), was in the afternoon of the very same Sunday summoned before the municipality, reprimanded, and dismissed from his offices. On his way there and back he was assailed by the mob with insults and missiles, and even guns were fired in the crowd. On the following Sunday some of the parties attempted to make their way to Morges, in the hope of being able to join the congregation there; but they were watched, and driven back to their houses by showers of stones. At Cour, near Lausanne, a party, consisting chiefly of ladies, had assembled in the house of a lady of property, well known for her beneficence, on a Communion Sunday; at the very moment when the minister

was about to administer the Sacrament, the house was assailed by a shower of stones. While some of the gentlemen present made their way to Lausanne for assistance, the ladies escaped by the back to a neighbouring country-house; but they could not get to their own homes without a strong escort of gentlemen who hastened to their assistance, and protected them as well as they could from the violence of the mob. At Montreux, pastor Monnard, one of the most distinguished of the clergy of the Canton de Vaud, was expected to officiate in a congregation, which would have consisted of about 150 individuals, though, as the alarm was given in time, only about sixty actually came to the place of assembly. A little before the time of service the mob, who had obtained information of the proposed meeting, took possession of the parish engine, and as the worshippers arrived, they were successively drenched (this scene occurred in the middle of January), without distinction of age or sex. Among those who suffered most, were pastor Monnard, who was wet to the skin; an infirm old lady, and two invalids, who had come to reside in the village for the mildness of the climate. In the middle of the disturbance the *juge de paix* of the place, an old gentleman of eighty-four, attempted to interfere, but he was forced to retreat by the stream of water being directed right upon him. Still Divine worship was celebrated, the parties being determined to show that they were in earnest, and prepared to suffer any thing rather than allow their religious privileges to be taken away. What renders the whole transaction more scandalous, is the fact that the prefect had been apprized beforehand of the intentions of the mob, and yet neither he nor his officers made their appearance till the mischief had been perpetrated. Still more atrocious were the scenes which were enacted at Aran and at Échallens. In the former place a private house in which a few persons, not a dozen in all, had met on Sunday, the 1st of March, to read and pray together, was assailed by a set of lawless fellows, who forced their way in, tore the Bible and the Hymn-books to pieces, and then threw themselves upon the persons assembled, the greater part of them women, tied them with ropes and dragged them through the streets in fear of their lives; two of the women were taken in this state with ropes round their necks to a neighbouring village, where at last some parties came to their assistance, and released them from the clutches of their persecutors. At Échallens the fury of the mob was directed against the institution of Deaconesses or Protestant Sisters of Charity, established in that place. One of the rooms of the institution, which comprises a hospital, was used as a chapel, and in consequence of the events that had taken place, many of the inhabitants of Échallens repaired thither in preference to the church. On the 19th of April, the two Sunday services had been held as usual, and the inmates of the house, chiefly females and patients, were on the point of retiring to rest, when a mob of from forty to fifty men made its appearance in front of the establishment, which lies a little way out of the borough, armed with bludgeons and axes. Scouts having been placed on all the roads leading to the building, a shot was fired by way

of signal, and the word of command given; upon which the whole body of assailants stormed the house, and having forced their way into the chapel, they tore the Bible, and demolished every part of the furniture; uttering the most horrible threats, declaring that they would have the life of the minister, who is resident director; and that they would throw both the patients and the sisters out of the windows. Fortunately the two physicians connected with the establishment obtained information of what was going forward, and collected among the inhabitants of Échallens, who are greatly benefited by the institution, a sufficient force to come to the rescue. This timely aid arrived just as the demolition of the chapel was completed, and drove off the mob; a guard was then left on the premises, which proved any thing but an unnecessary precaution, as some of the rioters returned in the middle of the night, and endeavoured to force an entrance. The institution has since been closed, and the sisters and patients have been dispersed.

Amidst all these disorders the government and its agents are looking on complacently; no means are taken either to prevent or to punish these outrages. If any demonstration of interference is made, it is delayed till the mischief has been effected; and punishment is inflicted, not on the rioters, but on their victims, who are told that if they choose to persist in a course which is evidently obnoxious to the people, they must take the consequences, and are justly to be held responsible for the disorders which their conduct occasions. In the last-mentioned case of Échallens, the inertness and indifference of the authorities were so scandalous, that the supreme tribunal at Lausanne deemed it its duty to order inquiry to be instituted; but scarcely had this order been given when the government interfered, and by intimidation induced the tribunal to quash its own order. The spirit which presides over the acts of the government may be gathered from the following passage from a speech delivered by M. Druey, the leader of the democratic party, and chief of the executive government, during the debates in the great council:—

"It is alleged that the government has attacked the freedom of religion. But the freedom of religion is a relative freedom. People ought to take care not to interfere with the freedom of others while they exercise their own, either by word or deed. If there is any irritation, it is not from opposition to certain individuals, but because those individuals think themselves better than other people, whom they look upon as damned, and pity them. When one hears children say to their parents: my poor father! my poor mother! is not that a most contemptuous proceeding, which must necessarily produce a reaction? Those who are attacked will defend themselves. If the Council of State has been obliged to take certain measures, it has not been through hatred of religious freedom, but with a view to avoid collisions. They say the domicile has been violated. But the Penal Code allows entrance into the domicile, in order to put a stop to great disorders. Much is said about aggressions on the freedom of religion; but is what takes place here, to be compared with what takes place in other countries? In England there is the greatest religious freedom; but that

does not prevent a chapel being demolished now and then by the multitude, and you may think yourself well off if you escape a thwacking. But there is no such outcry raised about it; the English are not such Sybarites; they have not yet got out of the habit of boxing. And do you fancy, when the Vaudois have carried their Sybaritism so far, as to require to be put up in cotton, that they will be able to shed their blood for their country? Let us be thankful, that there is as yet some energy left in Switzerland, some of that ancient vigour, that primitive savagery. The masses must preserve the power of the fist. Intellectual force is nothing if it does not descend into the arms; even as physical force is to derive its strength from intellectual force."

Where such principles are propounded by the head of the executive, it is not surprising that the populace should be guilty of all sorts of outrages and excesses; the only wonder is that such a government is tolerated in the civilized world. Not that the petty despots of Lausanne have been left altogether undisturbed in their career of iniquitous "savagery." They have met with rebuffs and remonstrances from more than one quarter. The president of the great Council of Zürich, M. Bluntschli, in his opening speech deplored that "the formerly flourishing condition of the Canton de Vaud had disappeared before a brutal revolution, which had within a few months brought matters to such a pass, that in a land where the word freedom is in every one's mouth, as well as in the *motto* of the national arms, the freedom of the evangelic Church is oppressed in a manner unequalled, except by the persecutions which the early Christians had to endure from the Roman emperors, or in modern times by the reign of terror of 1793." This home thrust excited the wrath of the democrats at Lausanne to the highest pitch; and they addressed a letter, demanding satisfaction with many big words, to the Great Council of Zürich; but they took nothing by their motion; for M. Bluntschli having declared that what he had said, and was ready to maintain, was the utterance of his private, not his official opinion, the Great Council of Zürich quietly informed M. Druey and his fellow-complainants that the affair was no concern of theirs. Another broad hint is said to have been given to their high-mightinesses of Lausanne by the government of Geneva, to which they made application for a supply of ministers to fill the vacancies. The Genevese government replied they had at the moment only a few missionaries at their disposal, who were on the point of going out to preach the Gospel to the savages in New Zealand, but whom, in consideration of the present condition of the Canton de Vaud, the government would be happy to send, as they could do so without making any great change in their destination. Of a more serious character were the remonstrances addressed to M. Druey's government by the Prussian and the English cabinets. The occasion for these was afforded by the government of the *Canton de Vaud* itself, which carried its hypocrisy so far as to transmit to the representatives of the different courts of Europe a collection of documents in justification of its conduct; which collection consisted, in fact, only of its own public acts,

omitting all the letters and other documents issued by the ministers, both before and after their secession from the establishment. The exact purport of the communication made by the Prussian ambassador has not transpired; on the contrary, the letters which passed between the British government and the Council of State of the *Canton de Vaud* have been published, and do equal credit to the moderation and to the firmness of the Foreign secretary and of his representative M. Morier. The latter having received the collection of documents, at once pointed out the omission of the documents which had emanated from the Church party, and required to be furnished with copies of them. The evidence being thus completed, the whole case was remitted to the government at home, and in reply a despatch from Lord Aberdeen was sent out, in which the course pursued by the government of Lausanne is freely reprehended as involving a dereliction of those first principles of civil and religious freedom, the maintenance of which distinguishes civilized Christian states; with an intimation, guarded however by the most positive assurances of respect for the sovereign rights of another state, that perseverance in that course might not improbably compromise the national independence of the entire Swiss nation. This remonstrance, which was transmitted to the Council of State on the 6th of February last, has, like all the others, hitherto remained without effect.

Meanwhile all assemblies for Divine worship, except in the national churches, have been prohibited in the chief places, and very generally throughout the Canton. But the national churches are but thinly attended; indeed in most places there are no ministers to officiate in them. An attempt on the part of the ministers who continue in office, to obtain from the government such terms as would enable their seceding brethren to resume their former stations, proved utterly abortive. The four classes of the Vaudois clergy were ordered to meet for the despatch of general business, and especially the choice of delegates for the examination and ordination of new ministers. Upon this M. Herzog, Professor of Divinity at the Academy of Lausanne, who would have been an *ex-officio* member of the board of examiners, resigned; a step by which the theological staff of the academy was reduced to one solitary professor. Nevertheless the board was appointed; but although it was understood that the examination would not be over rigorous, no more than twelve candidates presented themselves, of whom only two were students from the Canton de Vaud; and of these one withdrew of his own accord, and the other was rejected. Two of the strangers were in like manner turned away; so that the number of new pastors amounted in all only to eight.

While the difficulty of maintaining the National Establishment on the terms of the revolutionary government remains thus undiminished, the ministers who have resigned, continue silently to prepare the way for the reconstruction of their Church, independently of all connexion with the State. They published in February last an address to their parishioners, in which they intimated to them this their determination, and invited them to take courage under their present trials, and to

remain faithful to the Church of their fathers; declaring that they do not in the abstract reject the idea of union with the State; but that such union must be dependent on this express condition, that the State is not to oppress the Church, any more than the Church to domineer over the State. This address has since been followed up by a solemn "declaration of their faith" before the world, in which they both explain the motives of their separation from the National Church, and define the position they intend hereafter to occupy. The document is as follows:—

"In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen! The undersigned pastors and ministers of the Holy Gospel in the Canton de Vaud, who have adhered to the act of resignation determined upon on the 12th of November, 1845, and have thereby renounced their official relation to the State; to all Protestant and reformed Christian Churches, and to all the faithful of those Churches: Grace and peace be multiplied unto you from God our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

"At the moment when, by reason of our remaining true to our faith, our Church, and our ministry, the ties which bound us to the State have been broken, we deem it incumbent on us to protest that not only we have not, by that act, separated ourselves from the communion of the Protestant and Reformed Churches, but that we have united ourselves to them more closely, forasmuch as we have fought for doctrines which are dear to them all; viz. the spiritual supremacy of Jesus Christ over his Church, and the independence and integrity of the ministry of the Gospel.

"Wherefore, we declare, before God and the Church, that our faith is the same as that of our fathers; faith, that is to say, in the Holy Scriptures, and in the doctrines therein contained, which doctrines were summed up by our Reformers in the dogmatic part, *i.e.* the first twenty-one chapters, of the Helvetic confession of faith, and are professed in the liturgy in use in our Churches.

"We declare that we are ready with the help of the Lord to make any further sacrifices to our belief in the doctrines, for the maintenance of which we have been compelled to separate from the State, viz.:— 1. The sovereign spiritual authority of Christ and of his word in the Church. 2. The divine institution of the ministry of the Gospel.

"We declare that we are, and desire to remain, in communion of faith and love with all Christian Churches, and with all the faithful who, without having the same expression of faith which we have, believe with us that they can be justified before God, and sanctified, only by faith in the all-powerful efficacy of the sacrifice and the entire work of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, God manifest in the flesh. Lastly, we declare, that it is our ardent desire to enter into more intimate and more frequent relation with all the Protestant and Reformed Churches, in order that we may work together with them for whatever may tend to realize the Unity of Evangelic Protestantism, and promote the advancement of the kingdom of God.

"Done and signed, to be sent to the Protestant and Reformed Churches of Christendom, Lausanne, April 21st, 1846."

Here follow the signatures.

INDEX

OF THE

REMARKABLE PASSAGES IN THE CRITICISMS, EXTRACTS, NOTICES, AND INTELLIGENCE.

Abélard, his life and writings, 318—340; he falls under the tuition of the heretic Roscelin, 320; proceeds to Paris, 321; studies under Wm. de Campellis, 322; becomes his master's rival, 322; leaves Paris for Melun, 322, 323; returns to Paris, and takes the place of his former master, 323; studies theology under Anselm de Laudun, 324; becomes his rival also, 324, 325; his pride and dissolute character, 326, 327; he retires to the monastery of St. Denys, 327; returns to public life, 327, 328; is accused of heresy, 328, 329; committed to the custody of the Abbot of St. Médard, 330; returns to St. Denys, 331; gets into new troubles, 331; retires into solitude, 332; is sought out by his pupils, and founds the Paraclete, *ib.*; is made Abbot of St. Gildas, 333; removes Héloise to the Paraclete, *ib.*; his epistolary autobiography, 333, 334; his correspondence with Héloise, 334—336; he returns to Paris and teaches again in public, 336; his subsequent place of retirement unknown, *ib.*; his literary theological labours, *ib.*; he is again accused of heresy, and condemned at Sens, 336—338; the pope confirms the sentence, 338; Abélard obtains reconciliation through Peter the Venerable, 339; his death, *ib.*; and interment at the Paraclete, *ib.*; Héloise afterwards interred in the same tomb, *ib.*; repeated removal of their remains, 339, 340.

Alacoque, Margaret Mary, proceedings for her canonization, 265.

Alison, corrections of his history by the Right Hon. S. R. Lushington, 10.

Andrewes, Bp., on the power of the Keys, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 352, 353.

Annecy, University of, founded by St. Francis de Sales, 288.

Arnold of Brescia, his influence upon Abelard, 337.

Aulicus Coquinariæ, a reply to Sir A. Weldon's Court and Character of James I., 122.

Baden, disputes between the Government and the Romish hierarchy, 258—260.

Baptism, its iteration by the Romish Church in the case of proselytes from the Anglican Church uncatholic, 392, 393.

Beowulf, account of this poem by Wright, and edition by Kemble, 221.

Bernard, St., his forbearance in his controversy with Abélard, 336, 337; procures the condemnation of his errors at the Council of Sens, 338; is reconciled to him by Peter the Venerable, 338, 339.

Biber, Dr., his speech at the meeting of the National Club, 453—461.

Birch, his historical View of Negotiations from 1592 to 1617, 125.

Bishops, their office and their visitations, 269—299; original purpose of the office, 275—277; origin of visitations, 277, 278; deteriorating influences affecting the episcopate, 278, 279; examples of perfection in the episcopal character, 279; rules of the canon law touching visitations, 286, 287; touching the conduct of bishops towards their clergy, 295, 296; remarks on the votes of the bishops in Parliament, 448—450; danger to the Church likely to arise from them, 451, 452, 457; precarious tenure of their seats in Parliament, 462—468; importance of an increase of the episcopate, 468—470.

Björnstjerna, Count, his work on Hindoo religion, 300; defective character and incorrectness of his work, 303—317.

Bolingbroke, his opinions respecting James I., and their influence, 124, 125.

Brady, his historical labours, 122, 123.

Brewer, John S., his edition of Bishop Goodman's Court of James I., 120.

British Museum, incompleteness of its library in the department of English theological literature, 361.

Bull, Bishop, on the authority of the Church in matters of faith, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 353, 354.

Bunsen, Chevalier, his investigation into the history of Egypt, 87—119; inconsistency of his views with the Mosaic accounts, 88, 89; he rejects the inspiration of Holy Scripture, 89, 90, 118, 119; analysis of his work, 89—91; his system of arranging the ancient Egyptian kings erroneous, 93—96; his satisfactory ac-

count of the labyrinth, 96; his conjectures respecting the pyramids of Gizeh, 100—109; violence done by him to Egyptian etymology, 101—103; his erroneous system of Egyptian chronology, 109—119.
Burgess, Bishop, his English Reformation and Papal schism, 350.
Burke, his memorable speech on the Nabob of Arcot's debts, 6.
Burnet, Bishop, his influence in provoking others to write history, 123.

Cabala, character of this collection, 122.
Campellis, Wm. de, his celebrity, 322; retires from the University of Paris, 323.
"*Catholic*" *Association*, its constitution, and extensive influence, 59; its power in procuring the Emancipation Bill, 459; control which it exercises over the elections and over the goverment, 460, 461.
"*Catholic*" *Emancipation*, never intended by the Papists to be a final measure, 379, 380, 459.
Cave, Dr., on the pre-eminence of St. Peter, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 358, 359; his readiness to admit ecclesiastical miracles, 401.
Chrysostom on St. Matthew, edited by Field, 229.
Church, the English, the main object of the attacks of Popery, 18; her danger as described by Mr. Gresley, 243; her constitutional law imperfectly known, 269—273; defects of her ecclesiastical administration, 273—275; her oppressed position, 393, 394; analogy of the present aspect of affairs to that of 1829, 449.
Church, the English, in the colonies, comparative table of her episcopate and that of the Romish Church in the British colonies, 245, 246.
Church, the Evangelic, in Germany, Conference of Deputies from the different Protestant States at Berlin, 509—513.
Church, the Romish, encouraged by the British government, 19; supported by the State in France, 255; her menacing attitude in Prussia, 255—257; in Würtemberg, 258; in Baden, 258—260; at Frankfort, 260; symptoms of an ecclesiastical reform in Southern Germany, 260—263; her pretensions to rationality and liberality, 375, 376; her machinations and partial success in England, 380, 381; her anticipations of national calamities, 393, 394; her aggressions upon the British Church and constitution, 437—472; viewed with favour by the government, 437—439; advancement of them by the Religious Opinions Bill, 462—472.
Church and State, their present relation to each other examined, 439—472.
Church Architecture, works on it, 492.
Church Music, review of a number of works on the subject, 161—191; duty of the Church to make it efficient, 163—165; the spirit of the English Church favourable to its cultivation, 166, 167; the English musical faculty particularly suited to it, 167, 168; superiority of the English school of cathedral music, 168—171; its gradual decay, 171, 172; revival of the taste for church music, 172—174, 186, 187; a knowledge of it should form a part of clerical education, 174—177; inefficiency of the present system of Church music, 161—163; in the cathedrals, 177—181; in parish churches, 181—183; want of schools for organists, 183; necessity of raising the position of cathedral organists, 183—185; importance of encouraging Church music, 187—191; Plumstead on Congregational Singing, 492.
Clarke, Dr. Samuel, his Evidences of Natural and Revealed Religion, 400.
Cobbett, Wm., quoted by Hoeninghaus as a divine of the English Church, 370.
Colebrooke, on the Vedas, 305, 306.
Collier, on Catholicity, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 363—365.
Conclave, its proceedings, 505, 506.
Consistorial appointments during the year 1845, 265.
Constantinople, list of deposed and surviving patriarchs, 268.
Councils of the Holy Catholic Church, Manual of, 232.
Cousin, his edition of the unpublished works of Abélard, 318.
Crétineau-Joly, his history of the Jesuits, 15; critique of the work, 53, 54.
Cudworth's Intellectual System, 400.

Daily Prayer, recommended by Bishop Mant, 491.
Development, theory of, attributed to St. Augustine by M. Gondon, 375, 376; always a note of heresy, 376.
D'Ewes, Sir S., his autobiography and correspondence, 120, 128; his journals of Queen Elizabeth's Parliaments, 128.
Directorium, its subtlety, 36, 37; history of its composition, 36.
D'Israeli, his judgment of the character of James I., 127.

Douglas, Bp., his "Criterion," in answer to Hume's Essays on Miracles, 403; his examination of the miracles at the tomb of the Abbé de Paris, 403; effect of his work on all subsequent discussions of the subject, 407.
Droste Vischering, Archbishop of Cologne, the Pope's allocution on the occasion of his death, 256.
Du Pin, Dr., his proposals to Archbishop Wake for a Union of the Churches of England and France, 350.

Education, difficulties respecting it created by the Papists, in France, 246—255; in Germany, 256, 257; in England, 381—384; extent of the want of popular Education in England, 473, 474; probable scheme of the Government on the subject, 474.
Egron, his work on the worship of the Virgin Mary, 58, 59.
Egypt, inquiries into its ancient history, 87—119; not colonized, as has been supposed, from Ethiopia, 95.
Eratosthenes, doubtful character of his catalogue of Egyptian kings, 110.
Eustace, the Monk, his story, 223, 224.
Evangelical Alliance, its radical unsoundness, 387.
Evidences of Christianity, mischief of unsettling men's minds concerning them, 395—397; not to be rested exclusively upon miracles, 405; importance of the dealings of God with the Jewish people as an evidence of Christianity, 405.
Exercitia Spiritualia, account of them, 24—38; their importance for enlisting men in the Jesuit order, 25, 33—37; general outline of the exercises, 26; the applicatio sensuum, 26; the contemplation of hell, 28, 29; bodily penances combined with the exercises, 29; system of self-examination, 29, 30; desecration of prayer, 30, 31; the invocation of the Virgin Mary substituted for the intercession of the Holy Ghost, 32; the meditatio de duobus Vexillis, 34—36; danger of unsettling the intellect of the exercitant, 36, 37.

Farmer, Hugh, his dissertation on miracles, 404; his explanation of demoniacal possession by accommodation, *ib.*
Fenelon, Archbishop of Cambray, his character, 292—298; his constant parochial visitations, 295; his scrupulous adherence to the canon law in his conduct towards his clergy, 295, 296; his mode of life, 296; his affability, 297.
Field, his edition of Chrysostom on St. Matthew, 229.
Field, Dr., on the Church, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 359—361.
Fitzwarrine, Fulk, his exploits, 224.
Fitzwilliam, Lord, author of the letters of Atticus, 369; his history and popish bias, 369, 370.
Fleetwood, his essay on Miracles, 400.
France, the Church and the University, 246—255; disputes between the professors and the Minister of Instruction, 247; reconstruction of the Council of the University, 248—254; M. Guizot's declaration on the education question, 254, 255; spread of Protestantism, 493.
Frankfort, dispute between the senate and the Romish hierarchy, 260.
Frankland, his annals of England from 1612—1642, 123.
Freiburg, Archbishop of, address to him of the clergy of his province, demanding ecclesiastical reform, 260—263.
French officers assisting Hyder Ali and Tippoo, 6; support given by the French to Popish missions in the British Colonies, 18.
Frères de la Doctrine Chrétienne, their probable connexion with the Jesuits, 55.

Garnett, Henry, canonized, 83.
Geddes, Dr. Alex., his attempt to explain away the miracles of Scripture, 406.
General of the Jesuits, his absolute power, 48—50; means of controlling him never acted upon except in defence of the corruptions of the order, 50, 83, 84.
Geneva, insidious proceedings of the Romish Church there, 454, 455; the Genevese government forced to recognize the jurisdiction of Rome, 456.
Génin, on the Jesuits and the University, 15; critique of his book, 54, 55.
Gigoux, his illustrations of the letters of Abélard and Héloise, 318.
Gondon, Jules, his writings on the English Church, 373—394; traces the social evils of England to the reformation, 378, 379; his disclosure of the tactics of the Romanist party in England, 379—385, 458—461; his ludicrous mistakes, 386; equivocation on the title-page of his last pamphlet, 386, 387; his history of the tractarian movement, 387—389; the importance of the late defections overrated by him, 390—392.
Gonzalez, General of the Jesuits, combats

the lax morality of the order, and narrowly escapes deposition, 84.
Goodman, Bp. Godfrey, his court of King James I., 120; a reply to the secret histories, 122; opinions and personal history of Bishop Goodman, 129; his statements to be received with caution, 139.
Greece, Wright on the popular superstitions of modern Greece, 221, 222.
Gregory XVI., his death, 504; his life and character, 504.
Greville, Fulke, his histories of the reign of James I., 121.
Grossi, Marco Visconti, translated, 241.
Guignard, Jean, canonized, 83.
Guizot, M. et Mme., their historical essay on Abélard and Héloise, 318.
Gunpowder Plot, the only plot in James's reign which was generally believed, 134, 135; the facts and Dr. Lingard's account of them examined, 134—139.

Halliwell, J. O., his edition of Sir S. D'Ewes' autobiography and correspondence, 120; his mistake respecting a Harleian MS. published by him, 121, 122.
Hammond, Dr., on Tradition and Episcopacy, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 354—356; 367, 368.
Harris, General, Lord, his life and services, 1—14; his character, 2; his strange duel with Captain Bell, 2; his share in the American war, 3; his Christian spirit, 4, 9; his bravery in the expedition against St. Lucia, 4; takes the command of a transport ship and saves her, 5; his introduction to Sir W. Medows, 3; accompanies him to India as his aide-de-camp, 5; distinguishes himself in the war against Tippoo, 7; is appointed commander of the forces at Madras, *ib.*; co-operates with Lord Mornington, 8; his success against Seringapatam, 9, 10; Lord Mornington recommends him for a peerage, 12; ill-treatment he receives from the government and the company, 13; Mr. Perceval does justice to his claims, *ib.*; he is appointed Governor of Dumbarton Castle, *ib.*; his retirement at Faversham, *ib.*; bravery of his eldest son, Colonel George Harris, at Seringapatam and Waterloo, 14.
Harris, historical and critical account of the life and writings of James I., after the manner of Mr. Bayle, 125.
Harvey, his collection of Tracts from the Fathers, in illustration of the thirty-nine articles, 229.
Heart of Jesus, Jesuit Sodalities under this name, 56, 57.
Heber, Bishop, account of his life, 491.
Hebrews, Epistle to the, Lecture on it by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, 489.
Hereward, the Saxon, his adventures, 223.
Hindus, their religion, 300—317; Colebrooke's essay on the Vedas, 305; specimens of the Vedas published, *ib.*; their system essentially polytheistic, 306; later origin and speculative character of the Upanishads, 309; they contain the doctrine of the metempsychosis, 310; variety of sects among the worshippers of Vishnu and Siva, 311; philosophic systems of the Hindus, 312, 313; their cosmogony, 313—315; their tradition of the Deluge, 315, 316.
Hoeninghaus, his theological cento, 343—370; unfairness of his quotations, from foreign writers, 345—347; from English writers, 348—369.
Hooker, his opinion on church music, 164, 165.
Howell's familiar letters, miscellaneous intelligence contained in them, 126.
Howes, Edmond, his history of the reign of James I., 120.
Hume, critique of his history of James I., 125, 126; his share in the controversy on the credibility of miracles, 401—404.
Hussey, Rev. R., his edition of Bede's Ecclesiastical History, 224.
Hyder Ali, origin of his power, 6.

India, British, Professor Wilson's continuation of Mill's history, 486; account of Indian Missions, 491.
Institutum Societatis Jesu, 15; account of different editions and comparative table of their contents, 38—40.
Ireland, public appeal of the magistrates of the north riding of Tipperary, 192; forbearance shown to crime by Sir R. Peel's government, 193; discouragement of loyalty, 193, 194; history and treasonable character of the association of defenders, 200—208; their engagement to exterminate the Protestant population, 203—205; other treasonable associations in 1795, 205—207; spread of Defenderism in the army, 207—209; origin of the united Irish system, 208—210; savage barbarities committed by the Defenders, 210, 211; judicial inflictions of the united Irishmen, 211, 212; their exaction of perjury, 212, 213; principal journals of the mal-contents,

213, 214; the advancement of Popery the object of the present agitation, 380.

James I., histories of his court and times, 120—160; origin of the secret histories, 121; republished by Scott in 1811, 122; replies to them, *ib.*; favourable character of Hume's account of his reign, 126; important changes in the character and foreign relations of England, 129—131; his title to the throne of England examined, 131—133; different plots against him, 133—134; the gunpowder plot, 134—139; the affair of Sir Thomas Overbury, 139—150; state of Europe during his reign, 150—156; faults committed by James in his European relations, 156—158; antipathy of the people against the Papists, 158—160; general estimate of James's character and conduct, 160.

Jebb, on Church Music and the Cathedral Service, 161, 173.

Jerusalem, difficulties of the Episcopal Mission of the English Church, 489.

Jesuits, order of, its constitution and principles, 15—86; dangers to be apprehended from it to the safety of the British empire, 15—17, 85, 86; treasonable character of its doctrines, 79—81; its preservation after being cashiered by the Pope, 17; its adaptation to every change of time and circumstances, *ib.*; its affected love of publicity, 19, 20; collection of documents connected with its history, 20, 21; history of its fall by Count A. de Saint Priest, *ib.*; origin and objects of the order, 21—24; terms of admission into it, 38—44; impossibility of receding when once entangled in its meshes, 44—46; the novitiate, 41—44; rapacity of the society, 41; mutual espionage of the members, 42, 43; its discipline a spiritual homicide, 46; blind obedience required, 47, 48; centralization of the power of the order at Rome, 48; the possession of immense wealth combined with the profession of poverty, 48, 49; different classes of members, 50—52; *Jésuites de robe courte*, 50, 51; statistical table of the order at different periods, 52, 53; various denominations under which the Jesuits disguise themselves, 53, 54; infusion of Jesuitism into other orders contemplated by the Directorium, 55; religious congregations formed under the auspices of the Jesuits, 55—60; introduction of Jesuit sodalities into the army, 57, 58; influence of the Jesuits by means of colleges and schools, 60—63; subtle provisions on this subject in the constitutions, 60, 61; liberalism of the Jesuit system of education, 62, 63; statistical account of Jesuit colleges and houses, 63; influence of the Jesuits by means of the confessional, 63—66; Gen. Aquaviva's directions to the confessors of princes, 66; responsibility of the order for the writings of its members, 82, 83.

Justin Martyr, his first apology, edited by Trollope, 228.

Kemble, his edition of Beowulf, 221.

Labre, Bénoit-Joseph, proceedings for his canonization, 265, 266.

Labyrinth, the Egyptian, account of it, 96, 97.

La Motte Fouqué, the magic ring, 241.

Leo Allatius, his story of his wonderful cure, 222.

Leo X., his life by Roscoe, 235.

Lepsius, Dr., his collection of inscriptions, 94; his account of the labyrinth, 97.

Liguori, St. Alphonso de, translation of his relics, 266.

Linant, M., his theory respecting lake Mœris, 97—100.

Lingard, Dr., insidious character of his history, 127, 128; its value, 128; sources from which he collected his materials for the history of James I., *ib.*

Lives of the English Saints, apparent good faith of the writers, 424—428.

Locke, his posthumous discourse on miracles, 400.

Loyola, Ignatius, his genius in discerning the wants of the Papacy, 22—24; ambitious character of his views, 65, 66.

Lucia, St., expedition against it in 1778, 4.

Lushington, Rt. Hon. S. R., his life of General Lord Harris, 1—14; his corrections of Alison's history, 10.

Luther, Centenary of his death, 506—508.

Lyall, Dean, his Propædia Prophetica, 405.

Manetho, value of his fragments, 110.

Marilley, Vuarin's coadjutor in the Romish machinations at Geneva, 455; appointed his successor, 456; refused by the republic and removed from its territory, 456; inflicted on it as Bishop of Lausanne and Geneva, 456.

Mariolatry of the Jesuits, apparent in the Exercitia Spiritualia, 32; sodality of the Blessed Virgin of the Annunciation, 55, 56; archi-confrérie du très-saint et

immaculé cœur de Marie, 58, 59; the Médaille Miraculeuse, 59; miracle alleged to be wrought by it at Whitwick, 432, 433; the miraculous image of Ancona, 429; fraternity of the Sons and Daughters of Mary in honour of it, *ib.*; Heathcote's Sermon on the Hyperdulia ascribed to the Virgin, 492.

Matthew, Father, his connexion with the general designs of the Papacy, 384, 385.

Merbecke, costly reprint of "The Booke of Common Praier noted," by Pickering, 161—173.

Merewether, Rev. F., his exposure of the pretended miracle at Whitwick, 431.

Michelet, on the Jesuits, 15, 54.

Middleton, Dr., effect produced by his "Free Enquiry," 402—404, 407.

Miracles, Ecclesiastical, opinions lately promulgated respecting them, 397—399; distinction between them and Scripture Miracles, 399; controversies on the subject in England during the last 150 years, 399—407; the credit of Post-Apostolic miracles shaken by Middleton's "Free Enquiry," 402, 407; recent revival of the controversy, 408—436; pretended miracles, St. Augustine's rules with regard to them, 421; examination of particular Ecclesiastical Miracles before the end of the fourth century, 422—424; impeachment of modern Romish miracles by Romanists themselves, 433; argument for the cessation of miracles after, or soon after, the Apostolic age, 435, 436.

Miraculous Events, said to have happened at Rome in 1796—7, 406.

Mœris Lake, theories respecting it, 97—100.

Mohammedan writers, their controversies with Henry Martyn on the evidence of miracles, 405.

Morality of the Jesuits, 66—84; fallacies by which it is supported, 67; the conscience of the individual wholly set aside, 67—69; Extraits des Assertions, 69; causes which have led to the corruption of Jesuit morality, 69—71; its indulgence towards the sins of "Catholics," 69, 70; scandalous compromises of the Jesuits with idolatry, 70, 71; their duplicity towards "heretics," 71; the infamous doctrine of probable opinions, 72—75; enumeration of sins justified by this doctrine, 75—80; extracts from the writings of the Casuists of the Order, 72—81; hardihood of the Jesuits in denying the charges founded upon their own writings, 81—83; proofs of the countenance given by the Order to the corrupt morality of the Casuists, 82—84.

Mornington, Lord, state of affairs in India on his arrival, 7; his confidence in General Harris, 8; alarm created among the Indian civilians by his plans, 8; recommends Gen. Harris for a peerage, 12.

Neo-Catholicism, its infidel character and approaching dissolution, 263, 264.

Newfoundland, plan for the local support of the Church, 266.

Newman, J. H., his theory of Development controverted by Dr. Moberly, 229; by the Rev. W. J. Irons, 243; by the Rev. W. B. Barter, *ib.*; by Dr. O'Sullivan, 487; by the Rev. F. D. Maurice, 488; by the Rev. H. Irvine, 492; by an Anglican Priest, 243; by a Quondam Disciple, 492; his importance overrated by Mr. Gondon, 389, 390; his defection to Rome no submission to her authority, 390; his views on Ecclesiastical Miracles a few years ago, 407; his recent opinions concerning them, 397—399; examination of his arguments on the subject, 408—435; his plea of antecedent probability, 414—420; rapid development of his doctrine on Ecclesiastical Miracles in the lives of the English Saints, 424—428; the miracles of the world of grace overlooked by him, 434, 435.

Nickel, Goswin, General of the Jesuits, attempts to reform the Order and is deposed in consequence, 84.

Oaths of allegiance, taken by Papists, valueless, 68, 439.

Oddeul, his translation of the letters of Abélard and Héloise, 318.

Orangeism in Ireland, 192—219; reorganization of the Orange Society, 194, 195, 218, 219; erroneous impressions abroad on the character of the Society, 195, 196; its origin and early history, 196—200, 214—217; the alleged Orange persecution in Armagh, examined, 200—203; services rendered to the Government by the Orangemen during the rebellion, 215, 216; false charges brought against the Society, 216—218; Mr. O'Connell's evidence on its character 217, 218.

Ordinations, Anglican, their validity, 492.

Osborne, his Memoirs of the times of James I., 122.

Overbury, Sir Thomas, history of his murder, 139—150.

Paley, his Evidences of Christianity, 404.
Paris, celebrity of its University in the 12th century, 321; distinguished men who taught or were educated there, 321, 322; its undisciplined condition, 326.
Paris, Abbé de, miracles at his tomb, 403.
Patrick, Bishop, on Tradition, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 351.
Patrick, St., his life by Jocelin of Farnes, republished, 430, 431.
Pearson, Bp., on the Unity of the Church, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 351, 352.
Penrose, his treatise on the Evidence of Scripture Miracles, 395, 405, 406.
Perring, Mr., assists Col. Vyse in exploring the pyramids, 88; his account of them, 91—95; his opinion respecting lake Mœris, 97—100; his essay on the original measures of the pyramids, 104; his account of the third pyramid at Gizeh, 105—109.
Pestalozzi, centenary of his birth, 508; testimony of the King of Prussia to his character, 508, 509.
Peyton, his Divine catastrophe of the kingly house of Stuart, 121.
Pius IX., his election, 506.
Pope, ceremonies attendant on the death of the pope, and the election of a successor, 504—506.
Propaganda, its head-quarters at Lyons, 18; statistical account of the increase of its operations, *ib.*
Prussia, differences between the government and the Romish hierarchy, 255.
Public Schools, improved tone of religious feeling in them, 480—483; appeal of Mr. Wordsworth to the Winchester scholars on private prayer, 481, 482; on the duty of young communicants in details of school discipline, 482; on reverent behaviour in public worship, 482, 483.
Pyramids, variety of opinions on their date and their object, 87, 88; proved to have been royal tombs, 88—92; sacrifices made by Col. Vyse in exploring them, 88; account of the different groups of pyramids, 91, 92; importance of arranging them in groups, 92, 93; Mr. Malus' account of the northern pyramid of Dashoor a hoax, 95; account of the pyramids at Gizeh, 100—109.

Quinet, on the Jesuits, 15, 54.

Ravignan, his defence of the Jesuit Order, 15, 25; his conversion to Jesuitism, 24, 25; his blasphemous statement on the danger of spiritual influence, 33.
Records, Ecclesiastical, of England, Ireland, and Scotland, from the fifth century to the Reformation, 241.
Regicide, justified by the Jesuits, 83; sanctioned by the Pope in the case of Jean Guignard and Henry Garnett, *ib.*
Relics, see *Saint and Relic Worship.*
Religious Opinions Bill, Dr. Wordsworth's letters on it, 439; unopposed in Parliament except by the Bishop of Exeter, 452; public attention drawn to it by the National Club, *ib.*; its plausibility, 452, 453; the Queen's supremacy compromised by it, 453; probably concocted by the Catholic Institute, 461; reasons why the Romanists press for such a measure, 461, 462; its pernicious consequences detailed, 462—472.
Robertson, J. B., his translation of F. Von Schlegel's Philosophy of History, 235.
Robin Hood, considered by Wright an imaginary character, 224.
Rome, its sepulchral remains explored, 475—479; interesting inscriptions, 470—479; legends originating in their being misread, 476; uncertainty of the supposed signs of martyrdom on the tombs, 477, 478; no countenance given by them to celibacy, prayers for the dead, or invocation of saints, 479.
Romish controversialists, their frauds and boasts, 341—394; their unchristian tone and spirit, 341—343.
Roscelin, his heresy respecting the doctrine of the Trinity, 320; becomes the teacher of Abélard, *ib.*
Roscoe, his Life of Leo X., 235; his Lorenzo de Medici, 491.
Rushworth, his collection of historical documents, 122.

Saint and Relic Worship, recent instances of, 265, 266.
Saint-Priest, Count Al. de, his history of the fall of the Jesuits, 21.
Sales, Francis de, his life by Marsollier, 269; his exemplary character, 279—290; rules which he drew up for himself on his entrance upon the episcopate, 281—284; visits each parish individually, 287, 288; obstacles against which he had to contend, 289.
Sawyer, Edmund, his collection of documents, known by the name of Winwood's Memorials, 124.

Schiller, Maid of Orleans and William Tell, 241.
Schisms, recent, in Scotland, pamphlets respecting them, 243, 491.
Schlegel, F. von, Philosophy of History, 235; Dramatic Literature, 491.
Scotland, contributions of the Spalding Club to the history of its reformation, 488.
Sismondi's Literature of Europe, 491.
Slavery, influence of Christianity in promoting its abolition in Europe, 241; abolition of it at Tunis, 267, 268.
Statutes relating to ecclesiastical and eleemosynary institutions in England, Wales, Ireland, India, and the Colonies, 240.
Supremacy, oath of, its terms inconsistent with the recognition of papal jurisdiction in the Religious Opinions Bill, 453.
Supremacy, spiritual, of the English crown, its foundation, 443; limited by the laws and customs of the Church, 443—446; duty of maintaining those laws and customs, 446, 447; danger of vacillation on the part of the Church, 447—449.
Supremacy, temporal, of the Pope over sovereigns, re-asserted in a recent edition of the Canon Law, 439; modern instances of the exercise of this power, 439, 440; other proofs of the continuance of the claim, 440; causes of the indifference of statesmen to this claim, 440, 441; dangers indirectly arising from it, 441—443; its recognition amounts to an abdication of the royal supremacy, 454.
Switzerland, continuance of persecution for religion in the Canton de Vaud, 513—518; declaration of faith of the secession ministers, 518.

Tertullian, his Apologeticus, edited by Mr. Woodham, 229.
Thorndike, various passages, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 361, 362.
Tippoo, Rajah of Mysore, his savage character, 6; extraordinary rapidity of his military movements, *ib.*; his end, 10.
Trent, centenary of the Council, 266.
Tunis, abolition of slavery, 267, 268.

Unitarianism, its present tendencies indicated by the publication of Strauss' Life of Jesus, 487.
Universities, English, designs of the Papists upon them, 459, 460.
Ursula, and the 11,000 Virgins, origin of this legend, 476.

Vatimesnil, his plea for the Jesuits, 15; superseded by the French legislature, 26.
Veronica, St., legend of, its origin, 477.
Vyse, Col., his operations at the pyramids of Gizeh, 87—119.

Wake, Archbishop, his answer to Dr. Du Pin's proposals of union between the Churches of England and of France, 350.
Waterland, Dr., on Tradition, misquoted by Hoeninghaus, 357, 358, 365—367; his strictures on a system of dishonest quotation, 368, 369.
Weldon, Sir Anthony, his court and character of King James I., 121; replied to in *Aulicus Coquinariæ*, 122.
Wellington, conflicting accounts given by Alison and Lushington of his failure, as Col. Wellesley, before Seringapatam, 11.
Wheatley, on the Eucharistic Sacrifice, misapplied by Hoeninghaus, 362, 363.
Wilson, Arthur, his life of James I., 120; inserted in Bishop Kennet's complete history, 123; character of it, 124.
Wilson, T., Bishop of Sodor and Man, edition of his works, 269; his life by Cruttwell, *ib.*; his character and mode of living, 290—292; his frequent parochial visitations, 291; his refusal to accept an English bishopric, *ib.*; his interest in the moral condition of the people, 292.
Winwood's Memorials, account of this work, 124.
Wix, Rev. S., his proposal for a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome, 349; quoted by Hoeninghaus, *ib.*; replied to by Bishop Burgess, 350.
Woodham, his edition of Tertullian's Apologeticus, 229.
Woolfrey, his attempt to get up a miracle at Whitwick, 431—433.
Woolston, his attempt to resolve all miracles into allegorical fables, 401.
Wordsworth, Dr., his defence of the old principles of the constitution in Church and State, 439—446.
Würtemberg, disputes between the government and the Romish hierarchy, 257.

THE END OF VOL. V.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
3 0112 076144507